

THE
EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS,

IN
GREEK AND ENGLISH,

WITH AN ANALYSIS AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY.

BY
SAMUEL H. TURNER, D. D.,
PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE IN THE THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, AND OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE IN COLUMBIA COLLEGE, NEW YORK, AND
AUTHOR OF COMMENTARY ON THE HEBREWS.

REVISED AND CORRECTED.

NEW YORK:
ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH, 683 BROADWAY.

1859.

9849

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1858,
By SAMUEL H. TURNER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

TO THE MEMORY OF

The Right Rev. William White, D. D.,

LATE BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF PENNSYLVANIA, AND PRESIDENT
OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY;

TO WHOSE EXTENSIVE KNOWLEDGE,
SOUND AND DISCRIMINATING
JUDGMENT,
AND WISE COUNSELS,
OUR CHURCH IN THIS COUNTRY
OWES A DEBT OF GRATITUDE WHICH CAN
NEVER BE REPAID; WHOSE UNAFFECTED PIETY, BENEVOLENCE
AND URBANITY SECURED THE PROFOUND RESPECT OF ALL GOOD MEN;
WHOSE DEVOTION TO THE CAUSE OF OUR ZION WAS SHOWN BY
A LONG AND CONSTANT ATTENTION TO HER UNITY AND
PROSPERITY; WHO, IN DRAWING UP A COURSE OF
THEOLOGICAL READING FOR STUDENTS OF
DIVINITY, PLACED THE SACRED SCRIP-
TURES IN THE MOST PROMINENT
POSITION, AS THE ONLY
SOLID FOUNDATION
OF DIVINE
TRUTH:
TO THAT
CLARUM ET VENERABILE NOMEN,
WHICH MUST EVER LIVE IN THE
GRATEFUL MEMORY OF
THE INDEBTED
AUTHOR;
THE FOLLOWING PAGES,
AS A WELL MEANT ENDEAVOUR
TO ELUCIDATE A PORTION OF GOD'S MOST
HOLY WORD, ARE RESPECTFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
August 1, 1858.

C O N T E N T S.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION,	ix
ANALYSIS,	1
SECTION I.	
Chap. I. 1-15.	
INTRODUCTION,	19
SECTION II.	
Chap. I. 16-32.	
THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF THE ARGUMENTATIVE PORTION OF THE EPISTLE STATED, WITH A VIEW OF THE MORAL CONDITION OF THE HEATHEN WORLD,	24
SECTION III.	
Chap. II.	
THE INCONSISTENCY OF JEWS IN THEIR CONDEMNATION OF GENTILES, AND THEIR FOLLY IN TRUSTING TO EXTERNAL PRIVILEGES,	30
SECTION IV.	
Chap. III.	
JEWISH OBJECTIONS MET AND SINFULNESS PROVED. GENERAL CONCLUSION DRAWN,	43
SECTION V.	
Chap. IV.	
JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH PROVED AND APPLIED BY THE INSTANCE OF ABRAHAM,	59
SECTION VI.	
Chap. V. 1-11.	
THE HAPPY CONSEQUENCES OF A STATE OF JUSTIFICATION,	71

SECTION VII.	
Chap. V. 12-21.	PAGE
COMPARISON OF THE RESULTS OF ADAM'S FALL WITH THOSE OF CHRIST'S REDEMPTION,	75
SECTION VIII.	
Chap. VI	
THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH AND SALVATION BY DIVINE FAVOUR, AFFORD NO ENCOURAGEMENT TO SIN, BUT RATHER PRESENT THE STRONGEST MOTIVES TO HOLINESS,	95
SECTION IX.	
Chap. VII.-VIII. 17.	
THE LAW CAN NEITHER JUSTIFY NOR SANCTIFY. IT IS THE GOSPEL WHICH ALONE CAN MEET, IN THESE RESPECTS, THE WANTS OF MAN'S WEAK AND SINFUL CONDITION,	105
SECTION X.	
Chap. VIII. 18-29.	
THE TRIALS OF LIFE AND THE BLESSINGS OF THE GOSPEL BOTH HERE AND HEREAFTER COMPARED. GOD'S PURPOSE TO CONFER ALL THESE BLESSINGS ON HIS REDEEMED. CONSEQUENT EXULTATION AND TRIUMPH,	134
SECTION XI.	
Chaps. IX. X. XI.	
UNBELIEVING JEWS ARE REJECTED AND BELIEVING GENTILES ADMITTED IN THEIR PLACE. YET THE REJECTION OF THE JEWISH NATION IS NOT ABSOLUTELY FINAL AND IRREVOCABLE. ON THEIR REPENTANCE AND FAITH THEY SHALL BE RESTORED,	158
SECTION XII.	
Chaps. XII.-XVI.	
THE PRACTICAL PART OF THE EPISTLE,	212

INTRODUCTION.

ST. PAUL, a descendant of respectable Hebrew ancestry, (Phil. iii. 5,) was a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, a city celebrated for its cultivation of literature and science, in which respect it has been placed on a level with Athens and Alexandria. If, in this position, he had not become thoroughly imbued with Greek learning, he must, nevertheless, have obtained a sufficient acquaintance with it to give a tone to his intellectual character. In early life, the young student left his native for the holy city. There he pursued his Jewish studies under the direction of the learned and judicious Gamaliel: Acts xxii. 3. Emulous of distinction, he took the palm in Jewish literature and Pharisaism from all his competitors: Gal. i. 14. Sincerely attached to the religion of his nation, zealous for all the traditions of the elders, a devotee of his discernment and ardour could not have resided in the capital, and frequented the temple, all the time that the prophet of Nazareth spent in the same places or their vicinity, without having had his attention drawn to the character of this remarkable personage, to the claims which he had openly set up, to the doctrines which he had promulgated, and to the extraordinary facts by which he had proved their truth and divine authority, facts which his bitterest enemies did not venture to contradict. On such a mind these things must have made a strong impression. He was well acquainted with the origin and history of the novel sect, and knew that its principles tended to overthrow the dominant system of religion. With that superciliousness which marked the distinguished ecclesiastics of the nation, he regarded the Nazarenes with unmeasured contempt, and the degraded "people who knew not the law as accursed:" John vii. 49. The impulse which had been given to the faith of Jesus after the descent of the Holy Spirit only increased his infatuated rage against the Christians.

The mental constitution of the Apostle and his religious views and habits were formed, therefore, under the combined influence of Grecian philosophy and that Jewish theology which was characterised by Pharisaic strictness and superstition. Thus was he subjected to a train of discipline which gradually prepared him to enter, by the powerful influence of the animating and enlightening Spirit of God, upon the sphere of action for which divine Providence had long before marked him out: Gal. i. 15.

It has been supposed by some writers that previously to that persecuting journey to Damascus which resulted in the Apostle's conversion, he had been brought by reflection and experience to feel the inadequacy of Judaism to meet the wants of man's moral nature. Olshausen makes the following representation. "The energy and determination of his will made him carry out his principles as a Pharisee to a fanatical extreme against the Christians; and it was not till he had done this that he was possessed by that deep longing which this system of life could not satisfy, and which led him to perceive the state into which he had fallen."* Neander also gives a still stronger representation of "internal impressions made in opposition to his will" on his Pharisaic mind, raising thoughts favourable to the new religion, and "producing an inward struggle repelled as Satanic suggestions."† I am unable to perceive any sufficient evidence to support these views. There is no proof that such deep longing or agitating impressions influenced his mind in the manner stated by these writers. The account in the Acts of the Apostles contains no intimation to this effect. A persecuting spirit, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter," characterises the agent of the Synagogue up to the very moment of his miraculous conversion. We have no evidence that any change took place in his mind favourable to sacred truth until that period, and this change is to be attributed wholly to divine influence. Olshausen allows that "the miraculous vision, and the startling nature of the announcement that he who was still the raging opposer of the crucified was henceforth to be his messenger to the Gentiles, are of course to be considered as the decisive causes of the sudden change in his spiritual state." This is certainly true. But he adds: "At the same time, we cannot doubt, that his sincere striving after righteousness by the mere works of the law had

* General Introduction to the Epistles of St. Paul, p. 3.

† Geschichte der Pflanzung, &c. History of the Planting of the Christian Church by the Apostles, Hamburg, 1832, Vol. I. p. 73.

already, though perhaps without his own consciousness, awakened in the depth of his soul the conviction, that his own strength could not attain to the fulfilment of righteousness, and this conviction brought with it the longing after something higher." A partial preparation of mind, therefore, for the miraculous call seems to be presumed; and it is consistent with this supposition, that Tholuck on John xii. 28, 29, adduces the instance of St. Paul alone hearing the internal voice, (Acts xxii. 9,) in illustration of his theory, that this voice can only be heard when the mind is in a susceptible spiritual condition. The writers above quoted draw an inference from what they assume to be the state of mind of the zealous Hebrew, and then state this inference as a fact. Whereas, neither the condition of mind nor the inference therefrom can be proved to have existed, although it may be granted, that it would have been very reasonable to have felt the one and deduced the other. This state of mind, which they regard as preceding the miraculous call of the Apostle, ought to be placed immediately after it; and was probably effective during his state of blindness preceding the visit of Ananias.

The origin of the church at Rome is a point involved in great obscurity, owing to the want of very early and definite data. Certain statements contained in some of the early fathers* have been thought to prove that the Apostles Peter and Paul or one of them planted Christianity in the imperial capital. But they merely show that the Christian body was established and settled in that city by their exertions. This may be entirely true, even if it had been formed there long before the time of their visit. When St. Paul wrote his Epistle the Roman church was in a very flourishing condition, and had excited general attention, (i. 8;) which shows that it must have been founded a considerable time before. The language of the leading Jews at Rome with whom he had an interview three days after his arrival there, (Acts xxviii. 22,) has been alleged to prove, that they either were or affected to be unacquainted with the existence of a Christian community in that city. But such an inference is unfounded. They merely request to hear the visitor's sentiments, remarking that the Nazarene "sect was everywhere spoken against." It is very conceivable, too, that so populous a city as Rome may have contained very many Christians, although they may have excited but little attention among Jews,

* See Irenæus, *Adv. Hær. Lib. iii. Cap. 1*, p. 199, Edit. Grabe, Oxon. 1702; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles. Lib. ii. Cap. 14, 15, 25, iii. 1, vi. 14*.

some of whom were prejudiced and others indifferent; and indeed, that these may have thought it expedient, in their interview with St. Paul, to conceal what knowledge they possessed. The idea of the Roman church consisting of two parties, Christians chiefly of Jewish extraction who adhered to the law, and Gentile converts who were free from any such attachment, has been very prevalent. It has even been supposed that the two parties were in a state of direct opposition; and the theory has been advanced that St. Peter was regarded as the head of one and St. Paul of the other, and thus the discrepancies respecting the early episcopal Roman succession have been attempted to be reconciled. See Cave's *Life of St. Clemens, Bishop of Rome*, Sect. 4, pp. 188–190, Philadelphia, 1810. If such views were well founded, the Christian community at Rome must indeed have made itself known, but in a very different manner from that stated by the Apostle. But the theory is not sustained by sufficient evidence. Certain parts of the Epistle evince the existence of differences of opinion and practice in matters indifferent, but not of open collision between the parties, a result which the wise directions of the author are well adapted and were doubtless intended to prevent. It is very probable that those Hellenistic Jews from Rome who witnessed the effects of the miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 10,) obtained some acquaintance with the Gospel, and perhaps were converted to it, before they left Jerusalem, and that, on their return, they informed their brethren of “the wonderful works of God” which they had seen, and announced to them the glad tidings of salvation. Either these or some other very early converts must have originally planted the church of Rome. The little community thus formed appears to have grown rapidly.

In the time of the emperor Claudius, the Jews were exiled from Rome. Suetonius, in his *Life of Claudius*, Cap. xxv., states as the cause, that the Jews had been engaged in a tumult, impulsive Chresto. Hence it is not improbable, that either a real attempt of some imperfectly converted Jews to raise an insurrection, or a calumnious charge of this nature, had given occasion to the edict of banishment. It is reasonable to think that many Christians were confounded with the Jews and shared their exile; and thus we find Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth, whither they had arrived from Rome, and where they became known to St. Paul: Acts xviii. 2, 3, 26. Their acquaintance with him must have ripened into a close intimacy, as Aquila remained a con-

siderable time with him at Corinth and Ephesus, and they both followed the same occupation. It is easy to perceive that thus the Apostle might become familiar with a considerable number of Roman Christians, and that gradually his knowledge of the state of their church and the interest which he felt in its welfare would have greatly increased.

That the Roman church contained very many Jewish converts is in itself altogether probable. This was the case with most of the early churches, and the general scope of the Epistle refers to a Jewish doctrinal element as influential, against which the Apostle found it necessary to guard his readers, and to which Gentile converts would have been exposed. Still it would seem that a large moiety of the Christians at Rome must have been of Gentile extraction. This is the only supposition which seems to harmonize with certain declarations in the Epistle. The writer refers to his commission to make known the Gospel among "all the Gentiles," and adds, "among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ:" i. 5, 6. He speaks of those at Rome to whom he is "ready to preach the Gospel," as a portion of the Gentiles: vs. 13-15. So also in xi. 13, "I speak to you Gentiles;" and in xv. 16, he represents himself as a priest of Jesus Christ "offering up the Gentiles," and this in close connection with the boldness he had used in addressing the Roman Christians. That the word which he employs cannot be understood in the general sense of people so as to comprehend the Jews, is evident from the manner in which the Apostle employs it to mark the distinction between them and the Gentiles. Comp. ii. 14, 24, iii. 29, ix. 24, 30, xi. 13, 25, xv. 9-12, 16, 18, 27, xvi. 4, 26.

The Christian body at Rome consisted then of both classes of converts. Each had doubtless its own habits of thinking and feeling in reference to the general topics of Christianity, and unquestionably differences of views and practices prevailed among them to some extent, as must have been the case in a greater or less degree in every Christian community. But there is no sufficient reason to think that the Epistle was composed in order to reconcile such diversity of views or to conciliate the differing parties. Neither internal nor external evidence sufficiently clear and decisive can be adduced to sustain this theory, which at some periods and with not a few commentators has been the prevailing one. As the Apostle had become greatly interested in the prosperity of the Christians at Rome, and an opportunity of preaching

the Gospel there had never been afforded him; he embraces the occasion presented by the intended visit of Phebe, to give them in writing a general view of its most important doctrines, namely, those of redemption by Christ, of justification through faith, of sanctification by the Holy Spirit, and of its design to promote the salvation of all men. The Epistle may be conveniently divided into two parts; the doctrinal, comprehending the first eleven chapters, and the hortatory, contained in the remaining five. The leading topics of the former portion are justification by faith in opposition to works either moral or ceremonial, and the comprehensiveness of the Christian scheme of salvation, which extends its blessings indiscriminately to all mankind. Other most important matters are interwoven with the development and discussion of these two fundamental and leading principles, of which the author, notwithstanding the diversified character of his instructions, never loses sight. As the ensuing work contains a somewhat minute Analysis of this whole portion, divided into separate sections, it would be superfluous to enter into any particulars in this Introduction.

It is unnecessary to say anything in defence of the genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans, which has scarcely ever been controverted. It appears to have been known by Clement of Rome and the venerable Polycarp, both of whom quote from it. The former in his Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 35, cites the words of i. 30, 32: "For they that do these things are odious to God; and not only they that do them, but also all such as approve of those that do them." The latter in his Epistle to the Philippians, chap. 6, extracts from xii. 17, "Providing what is good both in the sight of God and man."

Although the inscription appended to the Epistle is not a genuine portion of it, the statements which it contains are nevertheless correct. "Written to the Romans from Corinthus, *and sent* by Phebe servant of the church at Cenchrea." A comparison of various texts shows that the letter was written at the time of St. Paul's "three months' " residence in Greece which is mentioned in Acts xx. 3. Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 1-4, where he speaks of his intention to send a collection to Jerusalem and perhaps to go himself, with Rom. xv. 25, where, after having nearly finished his letter, he mentions the same design of going to Jerusalem. Compare also 1 Cor. xvi. 19 with Rom. xvi. 3, from which it seems that Aquila and Priscilla had left Corinth and gone to Rome. A com-

parison of Acts xix. 21 with Rom. xv. 28, shows the same purpose of visiting Rome after having been at Jerusalem. In xvi. 23, Gaius with whom the Apostle was staying sends his salutations to the Roman Christians. But from 1 Cor. i. 14 it appears that Gaius was a resident of Corinth. So also was Erastus, who in the same verse is mentioned as "chamberlain of the city:" Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 20. Phebe, who most probably was the bearer of the letter, was an assistant, and perhaps a deaconess of "the church at Cenchrea:" Rom. xvi. 1. There can hardly be a doubt, therefore, that the inscription is entirely correct. To determine the precise time of the composition would require a settlement of the chronology of St. Paul's life; and this involves several points of difficulty, the data of which are by no means certain. The periods adopted by different critics vary from A. D. 52 to 59.

In preparing the following Analysis and Commentary, my chief object has been to present the reader with the interpretation which, on careful investigation, appeared to convey the author's meaning. I have availed myself of such assistance as was within my reach, although I did not think it necessary to examine in detail several comparatively late productions of the prolific German press. Wherever it was possible, I have endeavoured to substantiate the views given, by Scriptural analogy in addition to legitimate usage of language. In employing parallel places, it has also been my object collaterally to throw light on the texts referred to when they involved any difficulty. That the results arrived at will be generally satisfactory is perhaps rather to be hoped for than expected, as the topics which must come under consideration in such an exegetical work comprehend several much controverted points of theology. I can say conscientiously, however, that it has been my sincere prayer and most earnest effort to be guided by a love of truth; and under the influence of this principle, I have laboured to ascertain and express the mind of the Apostle.

As in my previous volume on the Hebrews, I have employed the Greek text of Hahn, with a few changes in the punctuation. The work of Koppe, which is occasionally referred to, to which Ammon added some notes and Excursus, is contained in the 4th volume of his *Novum Testamentum Græce, perpetua adnotatione illustratum*, Gottingæ, 1806; the Edition of Stuart's Commentary is the second, Andover, 1835; Hodge's, that of Philadelphia, 1835. I have availed myself of the translation of Olshausen's

Commentary contained in the 13th volume of Clark's Foreign Theological Library, Edinburgh, 1849. The English translation of Tholuck having been made from his early edition, I have used his German work, published at Halle in 1842, entitled *Kommentar zum Briefe Pauli an die Roemer*, which is a much more valuable production than the former. If Mr. Robert Haldane had not adhered to the English translation of an edition long ago superseded, he might have spared both himself and his readers not a few of the censures which he so freely bestows on the able German scholar, whose subsequent investigations led him to omit many of the statements objected to. The strong theological bias of the Scotch polemical writer shows itself in many of his doctrinal expositions, and influences his exegetical inquiries. His "Exposition of the Romans" was published, from the fifth Edinburgh Edition, by Carter, New York, in 1847, and contains 746 pages. The *Hermeneutica Sacra Novi Testamenti* of Morus. in two volumes, Leipsic, 1802, to which I have once or twice referred, is a work of great value for the Biblical student. He must, however, be on his guard against the neological tendencies of Eichstædt, his annotator and editor.

ANALYSIS

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

SECTION I.

CHAP. I. 1-15.

INTRODUCTION.

THE author announces himself as an Apostle of the promised Messiah, who, although descended from David, was God's glorified Son in his exalted condition, which commenced with his resurrection: 1-5. He salutes all the members of the Church of Rome, which was celebrated for its primitive faith, and expresses his earnest wish to visit them for mutual benefit, although as yet he had not been able to accomplish his purpose: 6-13. A deep sense of the divine favours which he had received prompts his ardent desire to benefit all men, and to proclaim the Gospel even at Rome, notwithstanding the probability of its rejection by many, and also of his persecution: 14, 15.

SECTION II.

CHAP. I. 16-32.

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF THE ARGUMENTATIVE PORTION OF THE EPISTLE,
WITH A STATEMENT OF THE MORAL DELINQUENCIES AND TRANSGRESSIONS
OF THE HEATHEN WORLD.

As a reason for glorying in the Gospel, it is stated to be divinely efficacious to salvation, the condition being faith, and the benefit being intended for all who comply therewith. It contains God's scheme of justification, which is wholly of a living and growing faith, and reveals his anger against sin: 16-18. Even the works of creation have, from the very beginning, made the being and attributes of God sufficiently known to become a rule

to men with reason and conscience. But the Heathen disregarded this source of religious knowledge, and dishonoured God, falling into gross idolatry, in consequence of which they were abandoned by God, and allowed to perpetrate the most abominable immoralities. A description of Heathen wickedness closes the Section, and with it the evidence that the Gentiles could advance no claim to justification on the ground of moral obedience: 19-32.

SECTION III

CHAP. II.

THE INCONSISTENCY OF JEWS IN THEIR CONDEMNATION OF GENTILES, AND THEIR FOLLY IN TRUSTING TO EXTERNAL PRIVILEGES.

THE Apostle here censures the Jews for their wicked inconsistency, in practising the same vices for which they unscrupulously condemned the Gentiles. He tells them that God's judgment is irrespective of persons, and governed by principles of equity. Consequently they cannot escape merited punishment hereafter, when all, both Jews and Gentiles, shall be alike rewarded according to their respective characters: 1-11. The punishment of those who, without the advantage of a direct revelation, have nevertheless subjected themselves to the divine wrath, shall be proportionate to the degree of their religious knowledge, while that of Jews shall be awarded according to their superior religious advantages. To become acceptable to God, it is by no means sufficient to know and hear his law; it must be sincerely and conscientiously obeyed. And if individuals among the Heathen, living without the advantages of a direct revelation, do in this their natural condition endeavour to live agreeably to the divine law, their own reason and conscience being their governing principle, they show that this law is really their inward guide, though imperfect and consequently leaving them in a state of indecision, their reflections alternately accusing or apologising: 12-16. The Jew, with all his real and his boasted privileges, with all his knowledge and confidence in his own ability, with the divine delineation of religious knowledge and truth which he possesses, while he does the very things which he denounces, is not only absurdly inconsistent, but has become thereby the occasion of dishonour to God: 17-24. Then the author repeats more particularly what he had before said. Judaism is indeed beneficial to those who sincerely obey the law of God; but disobedient Jews are no more acceptable to him than disobedient Gentiles. And Gentiles who sincerely obey the law of nature which God has implanted within them, are as acceptable to him as they would be if

they had been Jews; and, moreover, such Gentiles shall condemn those Jews, who, notwithstanding the great privileges which they enjoy from the Scriptures and their covenant relation to God, do nevertheless break the divine law. For the true Jew, he who deserves the honourable name of the ancestor whose brethren were to praise him,* is in his heart what his covenant profession indicates, and however he may be disesteemed by men, shall be praised and honoured by his God: 25-29.

SECTION IV.

CHAP. III.

JEWISH OBJECTION MET AND SINFULNESS PROVED. GENERAL CONCLUSION DRAWN.

THE representation made in the former chapter being so directly opposed to the Jew's prejudice and long cherished self-esteem, very naturally raises in his vain and carnal mind feelings of opposition and hostility. These he vents in the objection, What, then, is the advantage of being a Jew? The answer is, Much in various respects, but chiefly in the divine revelation, of which the Hebrew Scriptures are the depository. The faithlessness of a part of the nation can have no influence prejudicial to God's fidelity. He is essentially true, as the Psalmist represents him: 1-4. But, resumes the Jew, if, as you maintain, our iniquity, leading to a rejection of the gospel, does in reality establish and tend to disseminate its scheme of justification among the Gentiles;—Well, rejoins the Apostle, shall we then absurdly accuse God of injustice in punishing you? Impossible, for he is the righteous judge of the world. The Jew renews the objection. If my false and wicked conduct contribute to the extending of God's truth and glory, am I nevertheless, through whom God is thus honoured, to be condemned and punished as a sinner? The answer is, Certainly, unless the mischievous principle be maintained, that the end sanctifies the means, the advocates of which are justly condemned: 5-8.

The Apostle then reverts to the subject of justification. He puts the question: Are Jews, in this respect, in a better condition than Gentiles? This he answers in the negative, and proceeds to prove that they, as well as the Gentiles, are delinquent, being represented by their own sacred

*The author undoubtedly alludes to the meaning of the word *Jew* as a descendant of *Judah*. Thus in Gen. xlix. 8, the Hebrew words for *Judah* and *praise* are of the same root. Observe also the language of Leah in xxix. 35: "Now will I *praise* the Lord, and she called his name *Judah*." On the former passage, Aben Ezra remarks: "Thou art *Judah*; according to thy name, and so (it follows,) thy brethren shall *praise* thee."

writers as grievous sinners, the descriptions being certainly intended of them : 10-19. All mankind are proved then to be guilty, and consequently it follows that justification is unattainable by obedience to the moral law, which was not promulgated with the intent of procuring this blessing, but in order to give men a proper consciousness of sin : 19, 20. But now, the gospel being established, justification, irrespective of law, is made known, the truth and reality of which were attested by the whole tenour of the former dispensation ; that justification which is extended to all sinners who believe in Christ, and which is founded on the redemption effected by his atonement. Him God hath publicly exhibited to the world as a proper sacrifice, in this way declaring his sense of justice to his violated law, and at the same time securing a sufficient ground whereon he may justify the believer. Such a system excludes all self-confidence and boast in human merit : 21-27. The general conclusion, in reference to the whole argument in the three chapters, is then drawn,—namely, that man's justification is by faith. Thus God appears as the universal parent of men, accepting both Jews and Gentiles on the very same condition. In conclusion, the Apostle guards against the supposition that this doctrine makes the law nugatory, affirming that, in a very comprehensive sense, it establishes its usefulness and necessity : 28-31.

SECTION V.

CHAP. IV.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH PROVED AND APPLIED BY THE INSTANCE OF ABRAHAM.

Thus far the Apostle has conducted his argument with a view to the undeniable fact that both Gentiles and Jews have flagrantly broken God's moral law, and consequently that justification on the ground of obedience thereto is precluded. And it is the moral law to which generally in the argumentative part of the Epistle he refers. But this is not invariably the case. The Jews attached an undue estimate to their ceremonial and ritual law, and especially to the initiatory rite of circumcision. And as this institution originated in the person of Abraham, their great ancestor, and from him had been perpetuated in his descendants through Isaac and Jacob to their own times, their connection by this covenant rite with the distinguished patriarch had become the occasion of extraordinary self-confidence. This ecclesiastical and national pride had been rebuked by John the Baptist ;* but weakness and vanity, often inseparable associates,

* Matt. iii. 9.

are not readily dislodged from their position, as they cannot easily be made to feel the weight of reason and argument. The same confidence was fondly cherished, and it gives occasion to the Apostle's remarks. He begins by an inquiry: Shall it be said that our great ancestor found the blessing of acceptance with God by means of anything ritual and external? It cannot be. For if Abraham were justified by works, whether moral or ceremonial or both, he would have had somewhat to boast of or exult in. But the Scripture puts his justification upon a ground wholly different, namely, his faith; which faith of his was graciously regarded by God as its accepted condition. Now it is a principle universally conceded, that the labourer claims his reward or stipulated payment as his right. It is a debt which his employer owes him, and it is received as such and not as a gratuity. But, for the benefit of the true believer, whose good works are not done in order thereby to claim this result, God regards his faith as available for his justification: 1-5. This divine method of accepting sinners was well known to David, for in describing the blessed condition of the justified man, he speaks simply of the pardon of his sins; which, of course, implies that his acceptance took place, not on the ground of his moral obedience, by which he had failed to secure any claim to favour: 6-8. Is this blessed condition exclusively that of the Jews? In order to answer this question, it must be kept in mind that the Scripture most expressly declares, that Abraham's faith was the condition on which he was justified. Now under what circumstances of Abraham was this condition made available? Was it before he had received the external sign of the covenant or after? Before, most certainly, that sign being an attestation of his previous justification through the faith which he had cherished before he received the sign. And, in accordance with the divine intention, this was the case in order that the great patriarch might become the spiritual father of all believers, so that even those of them who have not received the sign may nevertheless be justified; and the father also of his lineal descendants through Jacob, not simply to all who are so descended, but to those of them who imitate that faith of Abraham which he had before his circumcision. For the grand promise of being lord of the world, which was made to him with a particular view to the Messiah as his most distinguished spiritual descendant, was not given through or in consequence of the law, but of that justification which comes through faith: 9-13. For faith and the promise attached to it would be useless, if the blessings came through a reliance on the law. But this cannot be the case, because the law is broken, and its breach is followed by punishment. The promise is therefore graciously of faith, and thus is secured to all the spiritual progeny of Abraham, who is spoken of as the father of them all in the view of the Almighty One. Against all seeming probability he believed in the promise of God, that he and his aged wife should become the parents of a son,

being well assured of the divine ability and willingness to verify the promise. This faith of his, which, by its persevering steadfastness, notwithstanding long continued discouragements, showed itself to be a living principle, was accepted as justifying: 14-22. That it was so accepted is not recorded simply to eulogize the patriarch; but for our instruction and comfort, who shall also be accepted, if we believe in Christ, who died and rose again in order to secure to us this inestimable benefit: 23-25.

SECTION VI.

CHAP. V. 1-11.

THE HAPPY CONSEQUENCES OF A STATE OF JUSTIFICATION.

JUSTIFICATION is followed by peace of conscience and amity with God, procured through Christ, by whom, on the condition of faith, we are introduced into that favourable state of the gospel in which we are, and therefore can rejoice in a well founded hope of happiness, the fruition of which is partly here and partly hereafter: 1, 2. And not only so, but, under the influence of such hope, we can rejoice even in afflictions, knowing that their tendency is to produce patience; and that, a well tried character; and that again increases and confirms our hope; and that hope never makes us ashamed by failing us in any exigency; for God's love to us is communicated abundantly to our hearts by the Holy Spirit, whom he hath bestowed on us: 3-5. For when we were in a condition of spiritual weakness, Christ, in suitable time, died on our account and in our place, although we were ungodly and sinful persons; thus showing the greatness of divine love. For, in the place of a religious man, scarcely any one would be willing to die; or, the more vividly to illustrate the representation, it may be made somewhat differently, thus: For, in place of the good, the religious and benevolent man, whose life is spent in benefiting his fellow-creatures, some one perhaps might even venture to give up his life. This is the utmost limit to which human love may ever be expected to extend. But the peculiar love of God is shown in this, that he gave Christ to die for us while we were grievous sinners, and, of course, enemies to his law: 6-8. If, therefore, we have now been justified by his atoning sufferings and death, much rather may we reasonably expect deliverance by him from future punishment. For, to repeat the same general truth somewhat differently, if, while we were opposed to him in character and conduct, we nevertheless became reconciled to God through the atonement made by the death of his Son, much rather, after having been so recon-

ciled, may we confidently look for salvation through him, who lives eternally in heaven as our glorified and immortal intercessor: 9, 10. We rejoice, therefore, not only in our Christian hope, not only in the trials of life which tend to our best interests, but also in God through Christ, who hath now reconciled us, and given us a pledge of everlasting and unbounded happiness: 9-11.

SECTION VII.

CHAP. V. 12-21.

THE UNHAPPY EFFECTS OF THE FALL OF ADAM ARE MORE THAN COUNTER-BALANCED BY THE BLESSINGS OBTAINED THROUGH CHRIST.

IN accordance with what has already been said, the Apostle proceeds as follows: In the course of his remarks he shows that we have, at the very least, gained through Christ what we lost through Adam. As sin was introduced into the world by our first parent, and followed by misery and ruin, and in this way misery and ruin pervaded the whole human race, inasmuch as all became partakers of a sinful nature, and in accordance therewith committed actual sin:—For, although during the period of man's existence that preceded the Mosaic law sin existed, yet, as sin is not accounted where there is no law, and there was none which made mortality and the evils necessarily connected therewith the penalty of its infraction, and nevertheless mortality universally prevailed, its origin and dominion must be ascribed to some other cause; and that is the one just stated, namely, the sin of Adam entailing on all his posterity a sinful nature, which produces in all conscious agents sinful acts: 12-14. There is a correspondence between Adam and Christ as regards their relation to the human family. But this correspondence is not in all respects analogous. If, in the one case, misery and ruin follow, much rather may we expect abundance of grace and benefit as the bountiful gift of God, in the other. And if the sentence pronounced on one offence condemned, much rather is it to be expected that the forgiveness should be extended to many offences. If, on the one hand, death was allowed to reign, much rather, on the other, may we look for the ultimate triumph of those who receive the plenitude of God's gracious gifts through Christ. As, therefore, one offence occasioned the condemnation of all, so also does one course of righteous obedience and submission afford the means to all of that justification which brings along with it everlasting life. For, to express in other terms what has already been said, as Adam's offence became the occasion of the sinfulness of his descendants, so did Christ's obedience to his Father's will

become the ground of their justification and eternal salvation, which shall be received and enjoyed on the condition of faith and obedience : 15-19. The law was introduced not to justify, but to show the nature of sin, and thus it became the occasion of exciting sinful nature in opposition to its demands, and in these circumstances grace abounds still more, God's favour extending even to life eternal : 20, 21.

SECTION VIII.

CHAP. VI.

THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH AND SALVATION BY DIVINE FAVOUR, AFFORD NO ENCOURAGEMENT TO SIN, BUT RATHER PRESENT THE STRONGEST MOTIVES TO HOLINESS.

Do the doctrines stated sanction the inference, that we may indulge in sin in order to afford full scope for the exercise of divine favour? Most certainly not. This would be at variance with our condition as baptized into Christ, by which baptism we became spiritually dead, buried, and risen, through divine power; and moreover, avow our obligations to abandon sin and live a life of holiness. The moral resurrection thus implied, and further inculcated, implies also a belief in a future glorious resurrection, which, according to the divine intention, as shown by the scheme of the gospel, is a result of the moral : 1-9. As Christ died once on account of sin, and now liveth in heaven to the glory of God, so should we regard ourselves as dead to sin and alive to righteousness. We must not, therefore, permit sin to rule us, but rather submit to the holy law of God. And this we are enabled to do, inasmuch as we live not under the inefficient system of law, but under the gospel, which imparts divine strength. It were preposterous, then, and grossly inconsistent, to practise sin : 10-16. It is a cause of thankfulness that you have abandoned your former sinful courses, and have accepted the gospel. You have shaken off the yoke of your former master, sin, and assumed that of another, God and righteousness. As, in the one state, you derived no advantage from such a service, but the contrary; so now, in the other, you have present benefit in a holy and religious character, and the future reward of everlasting life in prospect. For the due desert of sin is ruin; but the gracious gift which God imparts through Christ is everlasting felicity : 17-23.

The two leading thoughts in the Chapter are these : that continuing in sin is to the fully baptized Christian both impossible and inconsistent; and that, as we live under the gracious system of the Gospel, sin must not be permitted to rule us.

SECTION IX.

CHAP. VII.-VIII. 17.

THE LAW CAN NEITHER JUSTIFY NOR SANCTIFY. IT IS THE GOSPEL WHICH ALONE CAN MEET, IN THESE RESPECTS, THE WANTS OF MAN'S WEAK AND SINFUL CONDITION.

It is the prerogative of law to rule the man during his life. In the case of the marriage relation, the death of either party dissolves the obligation on the other. And this analogy may be applied to the connection of the Jews with the law. You have become figuratively dead to it, that is, your union with it is dissolved; and this, in order that you may be spiritually connected with Christ, the risen bridegroom, and thus produce the genuine fruits of holiness. Formerly, indeed, our sinful passions roused into vigorous action by occasion of the law, showed their really ruinous character. But now, we are delivered from the incidental consequences of law, and, through the Gospel, placed in a condition to serve God spiritually: 1-6. Shall we therefore charge the moral law with sinfulness? This were a gross perversion of the truth. On the contrary, this law shows fully and clearly what sin is. It displays its deadly nature. This mischievous principle avails itself of the moral law to incite my natural evil passions. Formerly I lived without a consciousness of the obligation of God's law; but when the perception of this obligation came home to my conscience, my sinful principle displayed its vital energy, and moral and spiritual ruin was shown to be the inevitable consequence. Thus God's holy law, the intention and natural bearings of which are to advance spiritual life and happiness, was made the occasion of transgression and destruction, through the deceitful influence of sin. We see, then, that God's moral law is in the highest degree excellent, and that it is human sinfulness which has become the cause of all our unhappiness, thus displaying itself in its true colours: 7-13. We know indeed the spirituality of God's law; but, in my natural condition, destitute of the grace of the Gospel and under the uncontrolled influence of sin, I am compelled by this tyrant to do what the better part of my nature, reason and conscience, so far enlightened as to see the excellence of God's law but destitute of spiritual energy, revolts from. So that it is not properly I, not my reason and conscience, but my degraded nature that commits the sin. I know and feel, alas, that in this sinful nature of mine there is no spiritual good. I can, indeed, indulge the vain wish, but I have no power to obey, and therefore it is that I act in opposition to conscience and reason, thus showing that my character and

conduct are shaped by my degraded moral condition. I feel that when I would do God's will, the predominating influence in me is contrary thereto. For, although my reason and conscience are indeed pleased with the law, yet this unrestrained natural principle opposes their dictates, and subjects me to a state of absolute thralldom. Miserable man do I feel myself to be! How can I obtain deliverance: 14-24. I thank God that he hath provided means through Jesus Christ. And thus, in my Christian condition of deliverance, although indeed my natural depravity still yields to the demands of sin, yet my reason and conscience and now delivered spiritual being, not only approve of, not only are pleased with, the law of God, but actually and practically serve it, which before was impossible. In this state, then, I am no longer under condemnation, having been delivered by the Gospel of Christ; which effects what the law could not do, making a satisfactory atonement, and procuring divine assistance, whereby the Christian is enabled to live a life, not in accordance with fleshly impulses, but with those of the Holy Spirit of God: 25-viii. 4. Devotion to the carnal principle, which is opposed to God's law, produces utter ruin; while submission to the spiritual, brings along with it the truest happiness. If you have God's spirit, you are not so devoted. And if you have, and are therefore truly Christ's, although indeed the frail body must succumb to the natural effects of sin, yet the soul has already a principle of divine life; and, in the end, God will raise to life even your present corruptible bodies, on account of the Spirit, whom he hath given you as a pledge of this result. We are therefore under the strongest obligation to live according to the promptings and aids of the Spirit, and thus to be God's sons. The possession of this Spirit is incompatible with a condition of servitude to sin, and of consequent apprehension. The results of his action and influence are directly opposite. He makes us the adopted children of God and enables us most affectionately to recognise the privilege. He attests the blessed relation whence flow the consequences, fellowship with Christ, together with suffering and glorification along with him: 5-17.

SECTION X.

CHAP. VIII. 18-39.

THE TRIALS OF LIFE AND THE BLESSINGS OF THE GOSPEL BOTH HERE AND
HEREAFTER COMPARED. GOD'S PURPOSE TO CONFER ALL THESE BLESSINGS
ON HIS REDEEMED. CONSEQUENT EXULTATION AND TRIUMPH.

I REGARD all the sufferings of the present life, however afflictive they may be, as not at all comparable to the glory of that state of happiness which the gospel secures to its recipients. God's creatures have long been waiting for some such improved and blessed condition. And such expectation is quite reasonable. For they have been subjected to the present unsatisfactory and miserable condition, on account of God's glory, and in order to advance his purpose of leading men to ultimate happiness, of which they cherish the hope. For there shall be a glorious deliverance. And, as it is true that mankind in general have been in a state of distress and anguish until the present time; so it is also true that we, the favoured recipients of the divine blessing, do also deeply lament our degraded condition, and wait for the fulness of Christian blessedness, when our adoption as God's children shall be publicly recognised and also completed by the deliverance of our bodies from corruptibility, in the glorious resurrection at the last day: 18-23. We are saved indeed, but still we are in a state in which hope must be continually exercised, and "patience have her perfect work." And, as hope assists us, so also does the Spirit of God, who prompts in us most earnest and deeply felt though not to be fully uttered intercessions, which are in entire accordance with the will of God: 24-27. We know also that all the events of life promote the good of those who love God, and are partakers of the gospel which his benevolent mind hath planned. Them from eternity he regarded with affection; he predetermined them to be like his Son in moral character, in suffering, and in happiness; so that of this vast band of united brothers he should be the head. And, in harmony with this affectionate regard, he hath so called them that they received his gospel; and he justified and glorified them. 28-30. Who now can venture, with any prospect of success, to oppose those whom God sustains? What will or power can stand in opposition to God's? What blessing can be too vast for our Christian expectations? He who gave up his Son cannot be supposed to withhold any good thing. Nothing further is to be thought of or wished for. Who will dare to accuse those whom God selects and regards as his choice ones? Will God, who justifies them? Who condemns? Does Christ, who died, who

rose, who sits at God's right hand, ever more to intercede? Who or what shall sever us from Christ's love? Shall all the trials of life, however hard, lead us to withdraw from him, and thus destroy our connection? No, most assuredly. We triumph over all through his grace who hath so loved us. I express my feeling in the firmest persuasion that no created being whatever can effect such a severance: 31-39.

SECTION XI.

CHAPS. IX. X. XI.

UNBELIEVING JEWS ARE REJECTED AND BELIEVING GENTILES ADMITTED IN THEIR PLACE. YET THE REJECTION OF THE JEWISH NATION IS NOT ABSOLUTELY FINAL AND IRREVOCABLE. ON THEIR REPENTANCE AND FAITH THEY SHALL BE RESTORED.

AFTER representing the absolute necessity of an efficient plan of salvation, and the sufficiency and grandeur of that of the gospel, it was natural that such a mind as that of the Apostle, in view of the melancholy fact that the mass of his nation rejected it, should be overwhelmed with the deepest grief. He gives vent to his feelings, assuring his unhappy brethren by the strongest asseverations, that he suffers habitual distress on their account, and that, in order to secure their ultimate happiness, he could even forego the blessings of a connection with Christ, and subject himself to the greatest possible evil, if such a devotion were allowable and right. He displays at large the glorious privileges of his nation, ending with what is indeed the very chief, namely, that from them sprang the Messiah in his human nature, that wonderful being, who, in his divine, is supreme God, and to be eternally adored: ix. 1-5.

But, notwithstanding this unhappy condition of the Jews, although as a nation they have rejected the promised Messiah and consequently have themselves been rejected by God, it is not to be assumed that God's promises to their forefathers have failed of accomplishment. Some, and not a few, have chosen the better part. It is to be considered that the Israelite who is really worthy of the name is inwardly religious. It is not merely a connection with the people of Israel by lineal descent from the patriarchs, which constitutes the true Israelite in the spiritual sense, nor is it such a descent from the great founder of the race, which makes persons the spiritual children of Abraham. This is followed by an illustration of the doctrine drawn from a history of the patriarchs, and tending to show that the Jews need not be surprised at the statement, for God had always acted with their ancestors according to his own purposes, in bestowing particular priv-

ileges on the descendants of one to the exclusion of those of another. This is demonstrated in the case of Isaac, who was born, not according to the ordinary course of nature, but in consequence of God's particular promise miraculously verified. The same preference appears also in the selection of Jacob's posterity rather than Esau's, previously even to the birth of the ancestors, which proves that such preference was not founded on their individual character, but on God's own purpose. The Jews, therefore, had no reason to be surprised, or to complain of the divine arrangement, because the blessings of Messiah's kingdom were limited to a part only of their nation. Such a procedure accords with the analogy of God's former course of conduct : 6-13.

Shall God on this account be charged with unrighteous partiality ? By no means. Yet it is undeniable that, in the distribution of his favours, and in the infliction of his punishments, he acts according to his own pleasure. And this truth is illustrated in what was said both to Moses and to Pharaoh. In the former case, we are told that his own benevolent will prompts and imparts the kindness ; and this shows that his favours do not depend on human inclinations and efforts, but on divine goodness. In the latter, the Egyptian monarch is represented as sustained by his providence for the full display of his glory. And thus we see that he extends mercy to, and suffers to continue impenitent, whomsoever he will : 14-18.

Will you object that his will is resistless, and therefore he has no right to find fault with any who may become the occasion of carrying it into effect ? Will you say ' If God is governed by a regard to his own plans which human efforts cannot alter, and if he makes even human wickedness and our rejection of the Gospel subserve those plans, why does he find fault with us ? If he show favour to some, and suffer us to continue obstinate, why does he blame us, since such is his will ? '—The first part of the Apostle's reply is to this effect. ' Admitting that God rejects the greater part of your nation, well may it rather be asked, what right has a weak man to find fault with the All-Wise and Almighty One, for exercising his just and natural prerogative ? Has he not, as Creator, the right to place his creatures in whatever condition he chooses ? As well might the thing made complain of its maker for not having formed it something else. God has plainly a right to put the being which his power hath produced, in any rank among his various creatures, and to bestow upon it as many or as few advantages as he pleases. You would have had no reason to complain, if he had never granted you the benefits of his covenant ; and, therefore, cannot reasonably object, if, for sufficient reasons and in order to promote most important purposes, he withdraws them from you as a nation.'—But this is only a general answer to the Jewish objection. The Apostle now proceeds to reply more particularly, showing that the Jews have no reason to complain of their rejection, since God had treated them with the greatest indul-

gence. 'He hath borne long with your sinful conduct and persevering obduracy ; and now, that you have filled up the measure of your sins and are fitted for destruction, he hath abandoned you ; and he makes your rejection the occasion of extending his Gospel to Gentiles, uniting those who embrace it with the faithful Israelites, both of whom he hath prepared for the blessings of his kingdom, and both of whom he hath called to the enjoyment thereof:' 19-24.

The Apostle now illustrates what he had said, by applying passages from Hosea, in which the prophet speaks of the reception of the ten tribes into favour after their long abandonment by God ; and also from Isaiah, who announces the divine promise, that all the various and repeated excisions to which the Jews might be subjected, should not be utter and complete, but, on the contrary, that a portion should be preserved to perpetuate the nation. These divine promises he explains as verified in part, by the preservation as God's people of that portion who had embraced the Messiah : 25-29.—He then sums up the general conclusion, namely, that Gentiles have through faith obtained acceptance with God, which Israel as a body has failed to secure. The reason of the failure is, that they proceeded on a wrong principle. They sought to be justified by works, and rejected the Gospel scheme of faith, and thus, as had been predicted, refused, through their incorrigible prejudice, to admit the only Messiah : 30-33.

CHAP. X. The Apostle continues the same subject in this chapter. He expresses his earnest desire for the salvation of Israel, acknowledging their zeal, directed unhappily to establish their own method of justification in opposition to God's, which is faith in Christ. He is the great and ultimate object which the law uniformly held in view, and having come and established a sufficient scheme of justification, he hath forever abolished the law which cannot possibly be instrumental to this effect : 1-4. Legal justification might be expressed by doing perfectly the demands of the law, and, as a rightful consequence, living in God's favour as a state to be legitimately claimed. But God's justification, which is by faith, speaks of no such impossibility. It does not demand as its condition something particularly difficult. On the contrary, it offers an expedient within the reach of every sincere and resolute seeker after truth, namely, the Gospel system received by faith, and publicly professed by the true convert : 5-10. This most impartial and righteous system knows no difference among men. It presents its blessings indiscriminately to all, whether Jews or Gentiles, who acknowledge Christ as their divine Master and Lord : 11-13. But, in order to enjoy these blessings, they must truly believe on him ; therefore they must hear of him ; therefore he must be preached to them ; and the preacher, in order to preach effectively, must be sent. This is done principally by the Holy Spirit, moulding the minds of those intended for his truly Apostolic Ministry, in assimilation to the practical truths of his Gos-

pel, thus preparing them, by their own experience, as "scribes instructed for the kingdom of heaven," to make known to men the glad tidings which they themselves have duly appreciated; and then, through the institution of God's visible church, publicly admitting them into the honourable body: 14-15.

And what if some have rejected this Gospel? This was predicted and might, of course, have been expected. Still, the Gospel has been universally disseminated, fully made known both to Jews and Gentiles: 16-18. And did not the Israelites know that the blessings of Messiah's kingdom were to be extended to the Gentiles? Certainly they did. For an appeal to their great legislator, and equally great evangelical prophet, determines the question. Both speak of the rejection of impenitent Jews, and of the admission among God's people, of sincere and faithful Gentiles: 19-21.

CHAP. xi. Does this admission of the Gentiles in the place of unbelieving Jews imply the irrevocable rejection of God's ancient covenant people? Certainly not. The thought is abhorrent to the Apostle's feelings, for he claims the honour of being an Israelite himself, and a descendant of the peculiarly honoured tribe of Benjamin. No, God hath not so rejected his people whom he originally most kindly regarded. Consider what is said of the state of Israel in the time of Elijah. Although the prophet represented himself as alone adhering to the true God, in contradistinction to the whole nation, whom he supposed to have apostatised to idolatry, yet he is divinely informed, that God had reserved for himself seven thousand sincere worshippers. These were the holy germ of the nation, the very life principle of its being. Had ten righteous persons been found in Sodom, it would not have been destroyed. The spiritual leaven would so far have leavened the whole lump as to have preserved it from utter corruption. Thus did the seven thousand in the degenerate time of the prophet, and thus does now the holy remnant who have accepted Jesus as the true Messiah, the choice ones whom God has graciously chosen with the view of their becoming partakers of his favours, this gracious choice springing entirely from his own benevolence: 1-6. It appears, then, that Israel as a nation has not secured what it aimed at, but only that portion of the nation which accepted the Gospel. The remainder are unhappily given over, in accordance with representations occurring in the Old Testament, to judicial blindness, and its deplorable consequences: 7-10.

Shall we say now that the Jews have been permitted to refuse the Gospel, in order to effect their irrevocable rejection and utter ruin? Certainly not. The refusal has resulted in the reception of the Gospel by Gentiles, and this divine course of eliciting good from evil is kindly pursued by God in order to incite them to emulate the Gentiles and embrace the same faith. And were this to be the result, how vast would be the benefit to mankind, since their rejection by God has been made the

occasion of so much good to the world in general. If his wisdom causes even the unbelief of the Jews to advance his plans by extending a knowledge of the truth, much rather will the same wisdom make their submission to the Gospel illustrate its divine origin, and promote the best interests of mankind. In hoping for and anticipating the conversion of the Jews, I honour my office as an apostle to the Gentiles, whose full and complete conversion would be thereby promoted. I therefore so speak as to endeavour to rouse up the dearly beloved brethren of my nation to accept the Gospel, that they also may partake of its blessings. The first Jewish converts, and the ancient patriarchs from whom the nation is descended, are holy in the estimation of God; and so, in a limited sense, is the whole body. Let the Gentile converts remember, that the Hebrews were first the people of God, with the believing portion of whom they have but lately become incorporated; and let them learn to retain the advantages of this their spiritual position by humility and faith. Let them not boast themselves against that unhappy people, lest they also fall away and be rejected: 11–21. The divine dispensation towards both parties exhibits both goodness and severity. If the Gentile convert on whom God hath bestowed his bounty disregard it, he also shall be rejected; and the unbelieving Jew, if he turn to God in faith, shall again be admitted to favour. This is not only very possible, but it may reasonably be expected from God's benevolence, and may be regarded as a procedure altogether natural: 22–25. It is important, in order to repress anything like arrogance in Gentile Christians, that they should know and consider what may seem obscure in the divine procedure, namely, that the Israelites in part are permitted to be in a condition of spiritual blindness until the conversion of vast numbers from other nations. And this result shall be succeeded by their national conversion, as predicted in the Old Testament. For it must not be overlooked that, while, as respects the Gospel they are hostile to God and considered by him as enemies, and this condition of theirs has been overruled to promote the spiritual benefit of Gentiles; yet, as respects God's original choice of the nation to be his peculiar people, they are still regarded with affection on account of the beloved ancestors. For God does not alter his plans of mercy and kindness towards those whom he has blessed with their privileges. As Gentile believers were formerly in a condition of unbelief, but now have obtained the mercy of God in the Gospel through occasion of the Jews' refusing it; so now the rejected Jews are in a state of unbelief, that the goodness shown to Gentiles may become the occasion of their future conversion and admission to the divine favour. Thus God's plans evince his intention of extending mercy to all: 25–32. The Apostle then bursts out in an exclamation respecting God's unbounded wisdom and knowledge, and concludes with an ascription of glory. 33–36.

\

SECTION XII.

CHAP. XII.-XVI.

THE PRACTICAL PART OF THE EPISTLE.

ST. PAUL now proceeds with practical and hortatory directions. He urges his readers to devote themselves to God, to renounce the world, and to cultivate the various graces of the Christian life: xii. He inculcates obedience to the civil powers, xiii. 1-7, impresses the duty of love and conformity to Christ, reminding them that time is rapidly passing away, and eternity at hand: 8-14. He gives directions respecting usages and observances in themselves indifferent, and counsels those of various views and habits to regard each other kindly, and to yield the claim of judgment to God, to whom it rightfully belongs: xiv. 1-12. He warns against using one's own liberty of conscience in such a way as may occasion sin in another, inculcating such a course of conduct as tends to harmony and kindness; declaring that inward religion, and the peace and joy that accompany it, constitute the essential characteristic of the Gospel dispensation: 13-23. He presents the example of Christ as a motive to seek the general good, and to bear with each other's weaknesses: xv. 1-7. Christ was sent by God in confirmation of divine promises made to the early Hebrews, and also that the Gentiles might become the people of God and glorify him. He speaks of his own commission, and of its successful prosecution among people who had not heard the Gospel before: 8-21. He states his intention to visit the Romans on his way to Spain; also his present purpose to go to Jerusalem, with the contributions which he had collected for the poor Christians there. He requests their prayers, and solicits for them the divine blessing: 22-33.

CHAP. xvi. The Apostle now brings his letter to a close, by recommending to the care of the Roman church a Christian sister, and by various kind salutations, cautioning against persons who promote dissensions in the church. He concludes, invoking for the Roman Christians the favour of Christ, and through him ascribing glory to God.

COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

SECTION I.

CHAP. I. 1-15.

INTRODUCTION.

I.	Παῦλος, δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,	PAUL, a servant of Jesus Christ,	I.
	κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀφωρισμένος	called to be an apostle, separated	
2	εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ, ὃ προε-	unto the gospel of God, which	2
	πηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν	he had promised afore by his pro-	

CHAP. i. 1. "Separated:" As this is the meaning of the word Pharisee, which is derived from פְּרִיז, some writers have supposed that the Apostle alludes here to his former devotion to the Jewish law, while he expresses the thought that now he is separated for and devoted to the Gospel. This is not improbable, although quite uncertain. Olshausen rejects this "explanation as a mere play upon words." He distinguishes between the calling and the separation of St. Paul, making the former refer to his appointment by Christ to the apostolic office, and the latter to the confirmation of his original call "by the choice of the church at Antioch," an account of which is given in Acts xiii. 2. The body "from which he was separated" is therefore, he says, not "to be regarded as the world, but as the Christian church itself to which he already belonged." In the passage referred to the same word is indeed employed in reference to the appointment of Paul and Barnabas, whom the Holy Ghost directs to be *separated* for him. But the particular work for which they were to be set apart is that which is narrated in detail in the remainder of the chapter and the following one, as is evident from xiv. 26, where they are said to have returned on accomplishing it. St. Paul's divine call and appointment by Christ to the office of an Apostle required no external ecclesiastical sanc-

3	phets in the holy scriptures, concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord ; which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh,	αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις, περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα,	3
4	and declared <i>to be</i> the Son of God with power, according to the spirit	τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ	4

tion, any more than those of the original twelve. The several accounts of his conversion and call in the Acts,* fully prove what he says in Gal. i. 1, that he was “an Apostle not of men neither by man.” God’s purpose to set him apart to his service is expressed in the 15th verse of the same chapter, by the word here used ; and this reference is much more directly to the point than that alleged by Olshausen.

3, 4. “Concerning” may be connected with “Gospel” in ver. 1, or, which is perhaps better, with “promised” in ver. 2. In either case it is unnecessary to include, as some editors do, the second verse in a parenthesis.—“According to the flesh:” This expression relates to Christ’s human nature as subsisting during his earthly condition until his resurrection, and consequently implies his state of humiliation, as in John i. 14.—“Declared:” Either, decreed, determined, destined (to be) ; or marked out, in the words of Chrysostom, shown, professed, manifested.† In the original edition of King James’ translation, the marginal reading is “determined.” But that of the text seems preferable.—It is not asserted that Christ *became* the Son of God in consequence of his resurrection, but only that his sonship was publicly announced by that event. Comp. Ps. ii. 7, Acts xiii. 33.—“In power” may be used adverbially for powerfully, in reference to that almighty energy which effected the resurrection. But most probably the connection is with the immediately preceding words. “The Son of God in power” will then stand in contradistinction to “the Son of David according to the flesh.” This is the Rheims translation. Wiclif has “Sone of God in vertu,” the word being employed in the Latin sense. Compare the phrase “the sign (or proof) of the Son of Man in heaven,” in Matt. xxiv. 30.

“Spirit of holiness.” Two leading interpretations of this phrase have been defended. First, it has been explained in the sense of the Holy Spirit, that is, in the ordinary meaning of the words, the third person of the Trinity. Adopting this view, Ammon in his *Excursus* appended to Koppe, p. 345, gives this as the sense : ‘according to the predictions of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament,’ regarding it as equivalent to, “according to the Scriptures” in 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4. Others, retaining the same meaning of the phrase,

* For these accounts and allusions to them, see Acts ix. 5, 6, 15, 17, 20, xx. 24, xxii. 14, 15, xxvi. 16, 19, 20, Gal. i. 1, 12, 16, ii. 6, 7, 9, 1 Tim. i. 12.

† Hom. I. on Rom., Opera, Edit. Bened. Venet. 1741, Tom. ix. p. 432.

5 Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ of holiness, by the resurrection
 ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν from the dead; by whom we have 5
 εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι received grace and apostleship, for
 τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος obedience to the faith among all

understand *κατά* in the sense of *διά*, *by*, and explain thus: 'by the Holy Spirit in his miraculous operations after Christ's resurrection.' With this exposition, compare John xvi. 14, and Acts ii. 33. Thus Rosenmueller in his Scholia, and more fully in a dissertation published in the *Commentationes Theologicae*, vol. i. pp. 315 et seq.* But this interpretation, although it makes a clear and good meaning, is without any support from New Testament usage. The phrase "spirit of holiness" is indeed a literal translation of the Hebrew for Holy Spirit, but it is never once used in this sense in the New Testament, the expression always being *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* with or without the article; and no reason can be assigned why St. Paul should in this passage depart from the invariable usage. Besides, it loses sight of the evident antithesis between "according to the flesh" and "according to the spirit of holiness."

The second leading interpretation considers the two words as expressive of dignity, majesty, glory. Spirit and spiritual are often employed to denote what is excellent, perfect, holy, extraordinary and divine, (see 1 Cor. x. 3, 4, xv. 44-46, Gal. iv. 29,) and holiness, *ἀγιωσύνη*, occurs in the Septuagint as the translation of the Hebrew for majesty, splendour, glory. See Ps. cxliv., Sept. (cxlv., Heb.) 5, xcv. (xcvi.) 6. In Heb. ix. 14, where see the note, pp. 123, 124, spirit appears to be used in the same sense as in this place, and to denote Christ's divine condition as glorified Messiah, his elevated state in the exercise of his original divine attributes, and as man, of lordship over the universe. So perhaps in 1 Tim. iii. 16: "Was manifest in the flesh," that is, in human nature, "justified in the spirit," shown to be approved of and honoured by God in his gloriously exalted and divine condition. Comp. John xvii. 5, Matt. xxviii. 18, and Heb. ii. 9. Ἐξ is used in the sense of from, after. See Matt. xix. 20, and 2 Pet. ii. 8. The Greek is elliptical, and the preposition *ἐκ* must be supplied before *νεκρῶν* as before *μου* in Acts i. 5. The meaning of the whole may be thus expressed: 'a descendant of David, as to his condition of humiliation while in human nature on earth, (but) proclaimed the Son of God in power, as to his divine nature in connection with his glorified humanity, from the time of his resurrection.'

5. "Grace and Apostleship:" These words may express the two ideas

* This is a valuable collection of Dissertations exegetical and theological, edited by Velthusen, Kuinoel and Ruperti. It comprises six octavo volumes, and was published at Leipsic in 1794-1799. A Supplement by Pott and Ruperti appeared at Helmstadt, entitled *Sylloge Commentationum Theologicarum*, in eight volumes, in 1800-1807. Horne's Introduction, vol. ii. part ii. Appendix, p. 286, sixth edition, Lond. 1823.

- 6 nations, for his name, among
whom are ye also the called of
7 Jesus Christ: to all that be in
Rome, beloved of God, called *to be*
saints; grace to you, and peace,
from God our father, and the Lord
8 Jesus Christ. First, I thank my
God through Jesus Christ for you
all, that your faith is spoken of
9 throughout the whole world. For
God is my witness, whom I serve
with my spirit in the gospel of his
Son, that without ceasing I make
10 mention of you always in my
prayers; making request, if by any
means now at length I might have
- αὐτοῦ, ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς 6
κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, πᾶσι τοῖς 7
οὔσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ,
κλητοῖς ἁγίοις· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ
εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν
καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ 8
θεῷ μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ
πάντων ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν
καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ.
Μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, 9
ὃ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου
ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ,
ὥς ἀδιαλείπτως μνησθῆναι ὑμῶν ποι-
οῦμαι, πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσ- 10
ευχῶν μου δεόμενος, εἴπως ἤδη

of the Gospel favour in general and that of the Apostolate in particular, or they may be a hendiadys, meaning, the favour of the Apostleship. Compare the word *grace* in Gal. ii. 9.—“Obedience to the faith:” literally, ‘obedience of faith.’ The latter word may be understood either objectively or subjectively, and the meaning be, ‘obedience to the faith,’ that is, the Gospel, or, ‘obedience which springs from faith;’ or it may be taken adjectively, and the translation be, ‘faithful obedience.’—“For his name:” meaning ‘on account of his honour.’

6. “The Called:” The word is used to denote those who have been invited to receive the benefits of the Gospel, and also those who have accepted them. Here and frequently elsewhere it means the latter. See 1 Cor. i. 24; also vii. 17, 18, 21, where the verb also expresses the same meaning. It is God who is uniformly represented as calling men to the Gospel. See the texts referred to in the latter part of the note on Heb. iii. 1. “The called of Jesus Christ” are they who, by embracing his religion, belong to him as their Lord and benefactor.

7. The latter clause of the verse might be translated, ‘father of us and of the Lord Jesus Christ.’ But this would not be in harmony with other passages. The meaning is, “from God our father, and (from) the Lord Jesus Christ;” and this remark applies to St. Paul’s epistles generally. See particularly the introductions to second Timothy, where the ἡμῶν is omitted, and to Titus, where its position is different, and compare also all those texts which speak of the peace or grace of Christ. The author evidently represents grace as coming both from God and from Christ.

9. “With my spirit:” That is, with my whole heart, sincerely and ardently. See Eph. vi. 6.

10. “If,” &c.: ‘that by God’s goodness I may at length be so highly

- ποτὲ εὐοδωθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελή-
ματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς.
11 Ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἵνα τι
μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευμα-
τικὸν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς,
12 τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ, συμπαρακληθῆναι
ἐν ὑμῖν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πί-
13 στεως, ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ. Οὐ
θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί,
ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν
πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι
τοῦ δεῦρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ
καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς
14 λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν. Ἑλλησί τε καὶ
βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοή-
15 τοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί· οὕτω τὸ
κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς
ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι.

a prosperous journey by the will of
God to come unto you. For I long 11
to see you, that I may impart unto
you some spiritual gift, to the end
ye may be established: that is, 12
that I may be comforted together
with you by the mutual faith both
of you and me. Now I would not 13
have you ignorant, brethren, that
oftentimes I purposed to come unto
you, (but was let hitherto,) that I
might have some fruit among you
also, even as among other Gentiles.
I am debtor both to the Greeks and 14
to the Barbarians, both to the wise
and to the unwise. So, as much as 15
in me is, I am ready to preach the
gospel to you that are at Rome also.

favoured as to visit you.' In 2 Mac. x. 7, the Greek word has the same meaning.

11. *Χάρισμα* means any spiritual gift, whether ordinary or miraculous. See 1 Cor. vii. 7, Rom. xii. 6 et seq., 1 Cor. xii. 4, 9.

12, 13. "That is:" This is equivalent to, I mean. The Apostle does, as it were, correct what he had said. Instead of dwelling on the thought of obliging the Roman Christians by imparting to them some benefit, he speaks as if his visit would become the occasion through their mutual faith of comforting and strengthening each other. And so in the next verse he represents his connection with them and other converts as the means of benefit to himself: "That I may have some fruit;" that is, derive advantage. This is the proper meaning of *καρπὸν ἔχειν*. See vi. 21, and compare *μισθὸν ἔχετε* in Matt. v. 46, vi. 1. The sentiment also suits the modesty of St. Paul's character, and is entirely in harmony with that in the following verse.

14, 15. Strictly speaking, the Apostle was indebted to God, and hence he feels and expresses his obligation to benefit God's creatures; and οὕτω, so, under the influence of this consciousness, he is ready, to the utmost of his power, to preach the Gospel even in Rome where he would, most probably, be subjected to the severest persecution. The Greek may be pointed with a comma after οὕτω, and another after ἐμὲ, according to Griesbach and other editors, and the meaning be as just given; or both commas may be omitted, as in Hahn, and the whole clause expressed thus, 'it is my earnest desire.' In both cases ἐστὶ will be understood.

SECTION II.

CHAP. I. 16-32.

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF THE ARGUMENTATIVE PORTION OF THE EPISTLE STATED, WITH A VIEW OF THE MORAL CONDITION OF THE HEATHEN WORLD.

16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and

Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγ- 16
γέλιον· δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν
εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύ-
οντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ

16. HERE St. Paul enters on the argument of his Epistle, introducing it with this declaration. The full meaning of the words "I am not ashamed of" is contained in the parallel phrase of Gal. vi. 14, "God forbid that I should glory save in." The reasons follow. The Gospel is God's mighty instrument; it is intended to effect man's salvation; it grants this blessing on the condition of faith which is readily attainable; and its offers are unlimited, extending to all the human family.—"Power of God," like "salvation" for Saviour in Luke ii. 30, is the abstract for the concrete, meaning God's efficient means. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 24. "Every one that believeth" implies the necessary condition, faith in contradistinction to works whether moral or ritual, and also the comprehensiveness of the offer; although, according to the divine scheme, it was first made to the Jews, and their rejection of it became the occasion of its being extended to the Gentiles. The word *Greek*, both here and in several other places, is used in this enlarged meaning.

17. The reader who desires to see the various meanings which have been given to the phrase "righteousness of God" here, must consult the commentators. It evidently does not mean his justice, nor probably his kindness or any other attribute. The general sense of the word in this Epistle when connected with the author's argument or statements allied therewith, is *justification*, that is, pardoning, acquitting; or, *state* or *method* of *justification*. The last agrees best with the context in this place. It has been said to be a "comparatively unusual meaning," and not to "suit the opposition between 'our own righteousness' and 'the righteousness of God;'" as the former of these phrases cannot well mean '*our own* method of justification.' It is opposed also to the explanation of the Apostle furnished by the expression, 'the righteousness which is of God, by faith,'

- 17 Ἑλληνι. Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, The just shall live by faith.

Phil. iii. 9, which cannot, in that passage, mean ‘God’s method of justification.’”* To these remarks, which are unaccompanied by any evidence, I can only say that they appear to me incapable of proof. Justification, which is a proper meaning of the word, is probably used for the method of justification, and this idea will be conveyed by a literal translation: ‘God’s justification is revealed in it,’ naturally suggests the thought, that his method of justification is made known in the Gospel; and this is the fact. “*De modo et ratione explicandum esse videtur, quibus venia impetrari queat.*” Ammon in Koppe, p. 16. “*Ratio favoris divini consequendi per metonym.*” Wahl, Clavis Novi Testamenti sub voce, 5.

“From faith to faith.” I must again refer the reader, who wishes to see the various views which have been given of this phrase, to the commentators. I will state one or two, and then what seems to me the best exposition. Some connect “from faith” with the clause just explained, and read, ‘the righteousness of God from (or by) faith.’ Comp. iii. 30. The next two words are understood either in the sense of ‘to produce faith,’ or faith is supposed to be put for ‘the faithful;’ that is, the abstract for the concrete, as in Heb. x. 39 in the Greek. The meaning thus obtained is as follows: ‘The righteousness of God by faith is revealed in the Gospel in order to produce faith;’ or, ‘in reference to and for the benefit of the faithful.’ Macknight says of the former “translation,” that it “results from construing the words *properly*,” and that it “affords a clear sense of a passage which, in the common translation, is absolutely unintelligible.” It is sufficient to remark that such is his opinion. But, in respect to the last view, it may be said to be wholly improbable that the same word, in so very intimate a connection, should be used in such different senses; and, in respect to both, that the separation of the former half of the clause from the latter and the connecting of it with the first phrase of the verse, is most unnatural. Professor Stuart endeavors to show the contrary; but, I think, without success. Every candid reader must feel, that “from faith to faith” is a phrase which cannot be divided. But the Professor asks, “What can the meaning be of *revealed from faith*?” The insertion of the common ellipsis of *to be* after the verb affords a very ready answer. “From faith to faith” means ‘from a faith which continues to influence its possessor, and which, being in itself a vital principle, grows

* Hodge, p. 41.

- 18 For the wrath of God is revealed Ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργή 18
 from heaven against all ungodliness, θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσε-
 and unrighteousness of men, who βειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων,
 hold the truth in unrighteousness; τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατ-

and increases.' The same respected author, in considering what has been adduced as an analogous phrase, "to iniquity unto iniquity," Rom. vi. 19, remarks, that "in all such cases, the accusative denotes the *end* or *object* to which the thing that had just been named tends," and quotes as proof 2 Cor. ii. 16: "Savour of death unto death, of life unto life." But the remark is not applicable to other similar phrases, such as, "from glory to glory—from strength to strength," 2 Cor. iii. 18, Ps. lxxxiv. 7, which evidently expresses the idea of increase. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 17, in the Greek, which is but inadequately rendered in our Bibles "a far more exceeding." The Apostle's meaning of the clause under consideration appears to be this: 'In the Gospel God's method of justification is revealed (to be) from a living faith which perpetuates itself and increases by virtue of its essential character.' And I think that the sense of the quotation which follows confirms this interpretation. It is from Hab. ii. 4, and is cited also in Heb. x. 38. The prophet is speaking of the truly religious man's steady faith in God under apprehended calamity. He lives in a calm and happy state of acceptance and favour with God by the uniform exercise of a religious confidence. Thus his faith is the same as that which the Apostle represents as justifying.

18. "For:" This may be illative of the implied thought, that some such scheme of justification as the Gospel reveals is necessary for all men; or, the full development which the Gospel makes of God's anger against sin may be stated as another reason for the author's glorying in it. Comp. Acts xvii. 30.—"From heaven" probably qualifies "revealed," to which it appears to be added as indicating the divine source of the revelation.—"Who hold the truth in unrighteousness." The truth here intended cannot be that which is peculiar to Christianity, as is evident from the following verses. It means religious truth in general, such as mankind possessed in an early period, the influence of which they weakened, and much of which they lost, by inconsistent and wicked lives. The word rendered "hold" often means to suppress, restrain, and many commentators so understand it here. Wiclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva translation, all have *withhold*; the Rheims "*deteine*." But the other sense agrees better with the subsequent context, which speaks of the divine attributes as being "known," and of the Heathen world as "knowing God" and yet dishonouring him. Still, it must be granted that this meaning is quite defensible, as the general religious truth held by the Heathen was perverted and darkened by their sinful conduct.

- 19 *εχόντων· διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφάνέρωσε.* because that which may be known 19 of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed *it* unto them. For 20
- 20 *Τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἥ τε αἰδίου αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους· διότι γνόντες τὸν θεὸν οὐχ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ἡνυχάριστησαν, ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη 21* the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. Because 21 that, when they knew God, they glorified *him* not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their fool-
- 22 *ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία. Φά-*

19. "That which may be known:" The original is one word, with its article, and equivalent to 'the knowledge.' Similar forms may be found in the Greek of ii. 4, viii. 3, 1 Cor. i. 25, where the English translation has "goodness—which (the law) could not do—the foolishness and weakness."—"God hath showed:" either by an original revelation, or by the works of creation influencing the rational and religious faculties.

20. "The invisible things of him:" That is, his attributes and nature, as the latter part of the verse declares.—"From the creation of the world:" Either, by means of the created objects; or, most probably, from the very time the world was made. The Greek bears either sense, but the former makes the phrase, "the things that are made," a useless repetition. The general meaning of the verse is, that the works of creation have always been to such a rational and moral creature as man a sufficiently practical exponent of God's nature and attributes. Two particulars, however, ought to be considered in relation to this subject: first, that the Apostle is not speaking of a full degree of religious knowledge; and, secondly, that the influence on the human mind of man's original condition as stated in the book of Genesis and of any primitive revelation of which he may have been the subject, must be allowed their due weight. What such a creature as man, in his present state, might be able to ascertain by the exercise simply of his own reasoning on the works of nature, had he no other direct or indirect sources of information, is a very different question, and one which the Apostle's language does not take into consideration. A spurious philosophy assumes a certain conceivable condition of primitive human nature; but all well ascertained facts support the faith which maintains such assumptions to be groundless.

21. "When they knew:" That is, having enjoyed abundant means of knowing. Compare "seeing and hearing" in Matt. xiii. 13.—"Heart," *καρδία*. This word is often used by the Hebrews to denote the mind;

- 22 ish heart was darkened. Profess-
 ing themselves to be wise, they
 23 became fools, and changed the
 glory of the uncorruptible God
 into an image made like to corrup-
 tible man, and to birds, and four-
 footed beasts, and creeping things.
 24 Wherefore God also gave them up
 to uncleanness through the lusts of
 their own hearts, to dishonour their
 own bodies between themselves :
 25 who changed the truth of God in-
 to a lie, and worshipped and served
 the creature more than the Creator,
 who is blessed for ever : Amen.
 26 For this cause God gave them up
 unto vile affections : for even their
 women did change their natural
 use into that which is against
 27 nature ; and likewise also the
 men, leaving the natural use of
 the woman, burned in their lust
 one toward another, men with men
 working that which is unseemly,
 and receiving in themselves that
- σκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθη-
 σαν, καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ 23
 ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι
 εἰκόνοσ φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ
 πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ
 ἔρπετῶν. Διὸ καὶ παρέδωκεν 24
 αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυ-
 μίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς
 ἀκαθαρσίαν, τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ
 σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. Οἱ- 25
 τινες μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν
 τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει καὶ ἐσε-
 βάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ
 κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ὃς
 ἐστὶν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας·
 ἀμήν. Διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν 26
 αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας·
 αἷ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετήλ-
 λαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς
 τὴν παρὰ φύσιν· ὁμοίως τε καὶ 27
 οἱ ἄρρενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν
 χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας ἐξεκαύθησαν
 ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους,
 ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσι τὴν ἀσχημο-
 σύνην κατεργαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν*

but often also, as here, with a direct reference to the affections. Thus we read : “ With the heart man believeth unto righteousness,” or rather, justification, Rom. x. 10 ; that is, justifying faith must be cordial, and have its due influence both on the understanding and on the affections.

22, 23. “ They became fools : ” This may comprehend a declarative meaning ; they both showed and increased their folly. The absurd and ridiculous idolatry into which they were permitted to fall abundantly verifies the statement in both respects.

24–31. The Apostle now proceeds to describe the moral condition of the Heathen world. The corrupt and debasing vices into which men were allowed to fall, were in part a judicial punishment, and in part a natural consequence, of the degrading idolatry. The correctness of this description of the abandoned and wicked state of the Heathen, has been confirmed by various writers. Whitby and Leland, in their respective works on the advantages and necessity of a divine revelation, abound with evidence and illustration ; and Paganism as it now exists verifies the inspired statement, and shows that such results are the invariable concomitants of stupid ignorance and idolatry. It is to be observed, however, that this

ἀντιμισθίαν, ἣν ἔδει, τῆς πλάνης
 αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπολαμβάν-
 28 νοντες. Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἔδοκί-
 μασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώ-
 σει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς
 εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ
 29 καθήκοντα, πεπληρωμένους πά-
 ση ἀδικία, πορνεία, πονηρία, πλε-
 ονεξία, κακία, μεστοὺς φθόνου,
 φόβου, ἔριδος, δόλου, κακοηθείας,
 30 ψιθυριστάς, καταλάλους, θεο-
 στυγεῖς, ὑβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους,
 ἀλαζόνας, ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν, γο-
 31 νεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυν-
 θέτους, ἀστόργους, ἀσπόνδους,

recompence of their error which was
 meet. And even as they did not 28
 like to retain God in *their* know-
 ledge, God gave them over to a
 reprobate mind, to do those things
 which are not convenient; being 29
 filled with all unrighteousness,
 fornication, wickedness, covetous-
 ness, maliciousness; full of envy,
 murder, debate, deceit, malignity;
 whisperers, backbiters, haters of 30
 God, spiteful, proud, boasters, in-
 ventors of evil things, disobedient
 to parents, without understand- 31
 ing, covenant-breakers, without

description of the heathen is intended to apply to them as a body, and not to every individual. The same remark applies to the subsequent description of the state of the Jews, in the second and third chapters. This is in harmony with the general course of representation which pervades the argumentative parts of this Epistle.

"Truth of God:" Equivalent to, the true God. Compare the phrase, "glory of God," in verse 23, and also in Ps. cvi. 20, which the Apostle evidently has in view. "Lie," which is antithetic to "the truth," is the abstract for the concrete, and put for an idol, implying the vain and deceitful character of idolatry. Tholuck very appositely quotes similar language from Philo, who, referring to the idolatrous calf made by the Hebrews in the desert, says that "Moses was amazed at their substituting so great a lie, ψευδός, in the place of so great a truth, ἀληθείας."

Ἀδόκιμον, towards the end of the 28th verse, refers to ἔδοκίμασαν, at the beginning: 'As they did not think fit, *approve of*, God abandoned them to a state of mind *not to be approved of*, to be condemned, reprobate.'—ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, for ἐπιγινώσκειν, is literally, to have in knowledge, and means, to recognise and properly regard." ἔχειν, with the noun and preposition, is often used in this way for the verb. See 1 Tim. iii. 4. The same is true of γίνομαι. See 1 Tim. ii. 14, where "was in the transgression" is equivalent to transgressed.—Θεοστυγεῖς in verse 30, may be rendered either 'hateful to God,' or "haters of God." Wiclif has the former, and the Rheims "odible to God," the word being borrowed from the Vulgate, Deo odibiles. Tyndale, Cranmer, the Geneva, and King James' translations, have the latter. As all the other epithets relate to the character and properties of the persons described, the latter rendering is preferable. The natural "enmity" referred to is explained in viii. 7, to be a hostility to the law of God.—ὑβριστάς insolent and injurious persons.—"Inventors

natural affection, implacable, un- 32
merciful: who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.

ἀνελεήμονας· οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες, ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσὶν, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσουσι.

of evil things:" In 2 Mac. vii. 31, Antiochus is called "the author, or discoverer, or inventor, *εὐρετής*, of all mischief against the Hebrews." Virgil calls Ulysses, *scelerum inventor*. *Æn.* ii. 164.

32. Wiclif and the Rheims translator, following the Vulgate and a few Greek authorities, introduce the negative, "undirstoden not" or "did not understand," immediately after the word "God." Locke sanctions the same interpolation. But the external support of such a reading is not of much weight, and the sense resulting is at variance with the scope of the Apostle. He evidently appeals to the natural moral sense of mankind, as enabling them to recognise God's law in a degree sufficient to become to them a rule of action. Comp. verse 19–21.—The last clause of this verse is a climax. It describes the evil habit of the mind. The persons described not only commit iniquities, but enjoy a malignant satisfaction in so doing, and in associating with their wicked companions.

SECTION III.

CHAP. II.

THE INCONSISTENCY OF JEWS IN THEIR CONDEMNATION OF GENTILES, AND THEIR FOLLY IN TRUSTING TO EXTERNAL PRIVILEGES.

II. Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself. *Διὸ ἀναπολόγητος εἶ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις· τά γάρ αὐτὰ πράσ-*

CHAP. ii. 1–11. "Therefore:" This is not a mere particle of transition. St. Paul has convicted the Heathen of gross immorality, and consequently has proved that, on the ground of moral obedience, they can have no claim to God's favour, and must look for acceptance or justification to some other dependence. He is now about to prove that the situation of the Jews does not in this respect differ at all from that of the Gentiles. This is the *ultimate* design of his argument. Inasmuch, however, as the Jew, although

- 2 σεις ὁ κρίνων. Οἶδαμεν δέ, ὅτι
τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ
ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοῖς τὰ τοιαῦτα
3 πράσσοντας. Λογίζῃ δὲ τοῦτο,
ὦ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων τοὺς τὰ
τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας καὶ ποιῶν
αὐτά, ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα
4 τοῦ θεοῦ; Ἡ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς
χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνο-
χῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας κατα-
φρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν, ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν
τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει;
5 Κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητα σου
καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαν-
ρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ
ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιο-
6 κρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃς ἀποδώσει
ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.
thyself; for thou that judgest,
doest the same things. But we are 2
sure that the judgment of God is
according to truth, against them
which commit such things. And 3
thinkest thou this, O man, that
judgest them which do such things,
and doest the same, that thou shalt
escape the judgment of God? Or 4
despisest thou the riches of his
goodness and forbearance and long-
suffering, not knowing that the
goodness of God leadeth thee to
repentance? But, after thy hard- 5
ness and impenitent heart, treasur-
est up unto thyself wrath, against
the day of wrath and revelation
of the righteous judgment of God;
who will render to every man ac- 6

committing similar offences, did not scruple to criminate the Gentile, the *immediate* object of the Apostle here is to show him the inconsistency and culpability of his conduct. Thus we see the proper illative force of “therefore.” It applies, as other similar illative particles occasionally do, to the latter part of the verse. Compare “therefore” in John vii. 22, and 2 Tim. ii. 10, which most probably qualifies the words that follow. The author’s idea may be expressed thus: ‘Since those who commit such crimes are worthy of punishment, thou, O Jew, art therefore inexcusable, because thou art guilty of the very same things as those Gentiles, whom thou art continually condemning.’ The antithesis lies between “them that do them,” in i. 32, and “doest the same,” here. This is confirmed by the words in the next verse, “against them that commit such things,” and those in the following, “and doest the same.” Undoubtedly the censorious disposition and conduct of the Jews are meant to be denounced, but the chief point of the remark is, the gross inconsistency of judging and condemning Gentiles for the same sort of practices and vices in which Jews themselves indulged. No doubt the remark is of general application to all inconsistent men; but it is clear, from the context and the subsequent part of the chapter, that the Jews are particularly referred to.

“Judge” is here used in the sense of censuring, condemning, as in Matt. vii. 1, 2, and John vii. 51.—“We know:” It must be admitted by all.—“According to truth:” that is, equitable and right. Comp. Acts x. 34.—“Riches of his goodness:” Equivalent to his ‘abundant goodness.’ See ix. 23 and Eph. i. 7, ‘his abundant and excellent glory’ or ‘grace,’

7 cording to his deeds: to them . τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργον 7
 who by patient continuance in well ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ
 doing, seek for glory and honour ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι ζωὴν αἰώ-
 8 and immortality, eternal life; but νιον . τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ 8
 unto them that are contentious, and ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πει-
 do not obey the truth, but obeyθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, ὀργὴ καὶ
 unrighteousness, indignation and θυμός· θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία 9
 9 wrath, tribulation and anguish, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ
 upon every soul of man that doeth κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰου-
 evil, of the Jew first, and also of δαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος·
 10 the Gentile; but glory, honour, δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη 10
 and peace, to every man that work- παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν,
 eth good, to the Jew first, and also Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι.
 11 to the Gentile: for there is no Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ προσωποληψία παρὰ 11
 12 respect of persons with God. For τῷ θεῷ. Ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως 12
 as many as have sinned without ἥμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦν-
 law, shall also perish without law; ται· καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον,
 and as many as have sinned in the διὰ νόμον κριθήσονται, (οὐ γὰρ 13
 law, shall be judged by the law; οἱ ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου δίκαιοι
 13 (For not the hearers of the law are

and compare “multitude of thy mercy” in Ps. v. 7.—Ἀγνοῶν either, “not knowing,” and then the ignorance will be voluntary arising from sinful neglect and consequently criminal; or, not considering. The latter seems to be a legitimate meaning, as verbs expressive of knowledge are also employed to denote attention. Compare the use of *συνιέντος* in Matt. xiii. 19, of *ᾗδεν* in Acts xxiii. 5, of *σύνης* in Ps. v. 2, and of *ἔγνω* in Hos. ii. 8, Sept. See also *ξύνιεν* in the Iliad, i. 273. The same remark applies to the verb to hear, which often means to attend to, understand. See Matt. x. 14 and 1 Cor. xiv. 2.—“Leadeth:” that is, such are its character and tendency.—“Treasureth up:” The original idea of a treasure is here entirely lost, and the word means nothing more than *heap up* or *prepare abundantly*.—“Contentious:” literally, ‘of contention,’ like, “they that are of faith” in Gal. iii. 7, for ‘the faithful.’—“Peace” in ver. 10 is used in the Hebrew sense of blessing.

12–16. “For:” As usual this particle is illative. It sustains the immediately preceding remark. ‘There is no respect of persons with God, for he judges and punishes men according to the degree of their respective privileges and opportunities of religious improvement.’ The cases of Gentile and of Jewish sinners, who subject themselves to condemnation, shall each be decided on this consideration. Comp. Luke xii. 47, 48. In the final decision, the obligation of the Israelites to obey the law under which they lived shall have its due influence, as shall also that of the Heathen to obey the law of nature suggested by conscience and reason or

παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῦ just before God, but the doers of
 14 νόμον δικαιωθήσονται. "Ὅταν the law shall be justified. For 14
 γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα when the Gentiles, which have not

traditionary revelation. In a word, the state of each man shall be determined with reference to his situation and advantages. The word "sinned" is here used emphatically. In the language of Ernesti, there is "an accession of meaning to its ordinary signification." It means so sinned as to subject themselves to condemnation, sinned without repenting, or persisted in sinning. The phrase "him that worketh not" in iv. 5 means, 'who doth not work with a view to obtain justification thereby.' Such emphatic senses are readily perceived by a due attention to the context. The meaning of "without law," and "in the law," may be ascertained by referring to 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21. They express the condition of Gentile and Jew.

The Apostle has just said that a neglect to live religiously according to the condition in which we are placed, will subject us to merited punishment. What follows is intended to confirm this statement, and therefore is introduced by the illative, "for." This is a clew to the meaning of the next verses, which do not refer to the ground of justification, but simply assert the inefficacy of hearing and knowing God's law, and the necessity of sincere obedience to secure acceptance. It is not justification properly speaking but sanctification which is the subject of the verse, the whole idea of which is contained in Hebrews xii. 14, "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." St. James has the same thought, which he expresses partly in the same terms, i. 22-25. It is a great mistake to suppose that the Apostle is speaking here of justification. He does not mean to assert that any one can be justified by doing the law, for the whole scope of the Epistle and of Scripture in general is against this error. He means that the privilege of hearing the law, which the Jews overvalued, was useless unless they endeavoured to keep it. This endeavour, being a test of their sincerity and a proof of their faith, was also an evidence of their justification, but certainly not the cause of it.

Professor Stuart, in his translation of a part of Ernesti's Elements of Interpretation, remarks, that "Rom. ii. 13 states the rule of legal justification."* If the meaning were, that the words of the Apostle would fitly express such rule, the remark would be admissible. No doubt St. Paul might properly have stated this rule in the very terms here used, but the context shows that such was not his intention. He does not merely introduce "a supposed case," as the same author affirms in his commentary on verses 14 and 27. Professor Hodge also makes the same remark on verse 26. "Paul does not say that any Heathen does fully answer the

* Andover, 1822, p. 92, note on Sect. 181.

the law, do by nature the things φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῇ, οὗτοι
 contained in the law, these, having νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσι

demands of the law, *the case is merely stated hypothetically.*" So also on verse 27: "As pointed and understood by our translators, this verse expresses more than the preceding one.* The *obedient* Gentile *would* not only *be accepted*" &c. If the obedience is hypothetical, as it must be to harmonize with the Professor's statements elsewhere, the acceptance can be no more than ideal. The same hypothetical view is given by Barnes on verse 26. "The Apostle does not expressly affirm that this" (keeping the moral law,) "was ever done; *but he supposes the case.*" Haldane, in his peculiarly polemic Exposition of the Romans, pursues the same idea of hypothetical statement and argument.† But the very next verses to that under consideration, and also the 26th and 27th, afford palpable evidence that St. Paul is not speaking hypothetically. "When Gentiles do the works of the law," and "the uncircumcision that keeps the law shall judge" or condemn the Jewish transgressor, is evidently not the language of hypothesis. Much of the confusion of thought occasioned by this part of the Epistle has arisen from translating the original verb in verse 13 "shall be justified," while it should rather be rendered, 'shall be approved of, accepted.' The remarks of Morus on this point are very judicious. "The terms justification, salvation, new man, faith, are used in various senses, and therefore are not always to be explained in the same way. Attention to this will remove ap-

* The Professor has made no objection to such pointing and meaning; and, if he had, it would not affect my remark.

† Not to embarrass the reader, I prefer throwing a few quotations from this writer, accompanied by a remark or two, in a note. On the words "to every man that worketh good" in ver. 10, he says: "He who had performed his duty, *if any such could be found*, should enjoy rest and satisfaction." Is the verse hypothetical? and can it be believed that the Apostle here makes a promise which he knew was practically worthless?—On ver. 12: "*Without law*, that is, a written law, for none are without law. The Gentiles had not received the written law; they had, however, sinned, and they shall perish, that is to say, be condemned without that law. The Jews had received the written law; they had also sinned, they will be judged, that is to say, condemned by that law; for, in the next verse, St. Paul declares that only the *doers* of the law shall be justified; and consequently, as condemnation stands opposed to justification, they who are not doers of it will be condemned." According to this statement the Apostle affirms the condemnation of all Jews and Gentiles. The expositor's error results from not recognising the emphatic character of the word "sinned," and others in the same connection, as above stated, and also the true meaning of "shall be justified."—On ver. 13: "The doers of the law shall be justified.—By this we must understand an exact obedience to the law to be intended."—On ver. 25: "When, therefore, the Apostle says,—if *thou keep the law*, he supposes a case, not implying that it was ever verified; but if it should exist, the result would be what is stated." And on the next verse: "He supposes a case in regard to the Gentiles. This hypothetical mode of reasoning is common with Paul, of which we have an example in the same chapter, where he says, *that the doers of the law shall be justified*; of whom, however, in the conclusion of his argument, Chap. iii. 19, he affirms that none can be found." The exposition of the first text is erroneous, and assumed without proof; and in the latter the subject is different.—On ver. 27: "The fulfilling of the law and its transgression are here to be taken in their fullest import, namely, for an entire and complete fulfilment, and for the slightest transgression of the law." The reader will be gratified to learn, that after so much of what has been called hypothetical, (which, however inapplicable he may regard the epithet in reference to the Epistle, he will probably allow is strictly appropriate to the expositions,) "the Apostle, in vs. 28, 29, passes to what is reality, not supposition." So Mr. Haldane allows.

15 νόμος, οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ not the law, are a law unto them-
 ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν selves: which show the work of 15

parent opposition. And many objections to Christianity would never have been urged, if δικαιῶν had not been invariably translated *to justify*, ἔργα works, and so in other similar instances. Whenever the phrase *to become justified* is uttered, the hearer immediately attaches to it the idea of obtaining remission of sins; whereas this is not always its meaning. In Rom. ii. 13, δικαιωθήσονται signifies, will be approved of by God, will be rewarded by him. The discourse has nothing to do with remission of sins.* A striking instance of the use of this word in the same sense occurs in Matt. xii. 37: "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned;" that is, the language, as indicative of the character, will constitute a ground of divine approbation or condemnation. So also in Matt. xi. 19: "Wisdom is justified of her children;" which means, that the really wise will recognise the excellence of God's religious dispensations and heartily approve them.

The verses immediately following must be explained, if the context be properly regarded, of Gentiles not acquainted with a divine revelation. "By nature" is an erroneous translation, which might lead to the supposition of fallen man's having a natural ability to keep the divine law. It ought to be rendered, 'in nature,' meaning in their natural condition without a direct revelation. Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva translation, have "of nature;" Wiclif "kyndle," that is, "naturally," as the Rheims has plainly expressed the meaning of the Saxon word. It is equivalent to "without law" in ver. 12. The sense is as follows: 'For when Gentiles who have no directly revealed law, do in this situation live conformably to the general directions of revelation, although they have no such revealed law as the Jews have, yet the general principles of duty taught and inculcated by conscience and reason, are to become their law and to govern them. And these principles always coincide with those of revelation, and are shown in the lives of such.'

It has been supposed, that to speak of Gentiles living agreeably to moral law would be contradictory to the representation given of their religious and moral condition in the preceding chapter. But it ought to be considered that the Apostle is there representing the state of the Heathen as a mass; while here he speaks of some individuals. And besides, the obedience he has in view, can be nothing more than a general endeavour to live in accordance with that degree of religious knowledge which the sincere Gentile may have. There is therefore no inconsistency. Yet the supposition has given rise to an attempt to explain this passage differently, by changing the usual punctuation, and understanding by "Gentiles" those who had been con-

* Hermeneutica Sacra Nov. Test. vol. ii. p. 18, Lips. 1802.

the law written in their hearts, their *ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν*, συμπαρ-
 conscience also bearing witness, and *τυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδή-*

verted to Christianity. The sense thus elicited is as follows: "When the Gentiles, who by nature have not the law, do the things originally intended by and virtually contained in the law; when they renounce their idols, and no longer worship the host of heaven, but turn to the service of the living God; when they accept of that salvation that is now made known unto them, and submit to the righteousness of God that is now manifested in their sight; these, though they have not the law, are a law unto themselves, their faith in Christ and his doctrine does more than supply the place of the law of Moses; and by their submission to that promised seed, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed, and who is the very end of the law itself for righteousness to every one that believeth, they evidently show the great work of the law written in their hearts." It seems strange that a man should be able to persuade himself that such can be the Apostle's meaning. The statement is evidently irreconcilable with the whole scope of the context, and indeed with the very last words rightly understood. The Apostle is not contrasting Jews and converted Gentiles, but endeavouring to make the irreligious Jew feel his delinquency by comparing him with the sincere Gentile. Certainly men who had "faith in Christ" and had embraced his "doctrine," could with no propriety be said not to have the law, and to be a law unto themselves. Yet so satisfied is the author of this exposition with the truth of it as to affirm, that "the context plainly shows, and the sense of the whole Scripture proves, that the words not only fairly *may* but necessarily *ought* to be so translated."*

"Work of the law:" This has been supposed by some to be equivalent to the common expression, 'works of the law.' But in such case the word is always plural. Besides, such works are open to general observation, and the phrase expresses a holy course of living; whereas what is here spoken of is "written in the heart."—The phrase has also been regarded as pleonastic for law simply. Such pleonasms are not uncommon, and illustrations may be found in most commentators and lexicographers. But it is unnecessary to introduce such a principle here. The Hebrew word corresponding to "work," *מַעֲשֵׂה*, and the word denoting substance, reality, nature, *עֵצָה*, are used by Hebrew writers, as the term "work" is, in this passage, for reality, efficiency. Thus Maimonides: "The work, reality, *מַעֲשֵׂה*, of that element (or principle,) will be seen." Foundations of the law, in Bernard's Selections from the Iad, chap. iv. sect. 7, p. 11.† And in the

* See the Religion of nature proved to be a mere idol, by Charles Willats, M. A.; an article published in the Scholar armed, vol. i. p. 207, 210, Lond. 1795.

† This work is a small octavo volume, which will be found very useful in facilitating the acquisition of Rabbinical Hebrew. It was published at Cambridge in 1832.

σεως καὶ μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων τῶν *their* thoughts the mean while
 λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ *accusing, or else excusing, one an-*

precepts on repentance, chap. i. sect. 6, $\pi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ occurs in the same sense: ‘and the reality (nature) of the day of atonement,’ &c. The expression of St. Paul is probably of the same sort, and “the work of the law” is its reality, and efficiency, that which God hath engraven on the heart or moral nature of man. The sincere though imperfect endeavour of some Gentiles, to do what is right, shows that there is a moral law which the God that made them has stamped upon their nature. ‘The conscience of such men bears concurrent witness with this law of which it is the index, and their thoughts and reasonings interchangeably condemn or apologise for them;’ that is, sometimes do the one and sometimes the other.—The preposition $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ in composition with the participle here used, is considered by many as adding nothing to the sense. I prefer, as above, giving its proper meaning, because it makes a good sense, and corresponds with the author’s ordinary usage, as will hereafter be seen.—*Μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων* is rendered in our translation, “the mean while—one another.” Each of the two words certainly bears the meaning here given, but not in such a construction as this. Besides, “one another” cannot refer to the persons under consideration, for the Apostle is not speaking of some of them accusing or defending others; but rather of the actings of the mind on its own character and condition. “One another” relates to the thoughts, and the two Greek words mean interchangeably, alternately. The idea is that the thoughts and reasonings of the individual sometimes accuse and sometimes apologise for him.

The connection of the 16th verse has been the subject of considerable discussion. Bengel connects it with the word *show* in the beginning of ver. 15, which, although in the present tense, he regards as having a future meaning. Thus he elicits this sense: ‘character will then be manifested.’ Still the remainder of that verse will mark the condition of such Gentile mind in the present state of being. His meaning may be thus expressed; ‘And they will show that God’s law is really written on their hearts, (their conscience, &c.) in the day’ &c. Olshausen favours this arrangement. Such may be the construction; but all the clauses of the 15th verse appear to be so closely connected as to make any separation of one from another quite improbable; and moreover, it would seem that the verb should certainly have been in the future. The construction most usually adopted places vs. 13, 14, 15, in a parenthesis, connecting vs. 16 and 12. Professor Stuart rather prefers making the 12th also parenthetical. Tholuck objects to so long a parenthesis. But this is not unnatural in such a writer as St. Paul. It were idle to swell this note with illustrations taken from Hebrew and other ancient writers; but I think we need search no

16 other;) in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus 17 Christ, according to my gospel. Be- hold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy	<i>ἀπολογουμένων), ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε</i> 16 <i>κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν</i> <i>ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν</i> <i>μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Εἰ δὲ</i> 17 <i>σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζῃ καὶ ἐπα-</i>
---	---

farther for parentheses in the Bible, though they may not be marked either in printed editions or in manuscripts, than the Book of Deuteronomy and Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple; and in the classics, than the Odes of Horace, and the *Æneid* of Virgil. A diction springing from a glowing imagination is very likely to abound with parentheses. A writer of such a temperament, striking on a certain thought allied to another just expressed, would naturally dwell on it for a time; and, under the influence of such feeling, might indeed be drawn off entirely from his main topic, provided his temperament should get the better of his reason and judgment. But this is never the case with St. Paul, whose logical faculty and ardent feeling are always in happy harmony, the thoughtful element in his character counterbalancing the sensitive. If, on any occasion, he diverges from the most direct course, it is only, like some experienced and judicious fellow-traveller, to show you more fully the beauty and richness of the prospect, and to impress you properly with the sublimity of the scene. He always brings you back again to the original point of view. I can see no valid objection, therefore, in regarding the 16th verse as connected with the 12th, although perhaps not to the exclusion of a connection also with the 15th. A similar construction, most probably, appears in the 5th chapter, where the latter half of the 18th verse, though closely allied both in thought and language with the former, seems also to make the conclusion of a sentence, the first part of which consists of ver. 12th.

"My Gospel:" That is, the Gospel which I preach. Thus 'my trust,' in 2 Tim. i. 12, means, the Gospel with the preaching of which I have been intrusted. Our paraphrastic translation, "that which I have committed unto him," does not give the right meaning, which would rather be paraphrastically expressed by, 'that which has been committed unto me.' This will be evident to any one who will carefully compare in the Greek 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 20, and 2 Tim. i. 14. The silly exposition which would make "My Gospel" equivalent to the Gospel of St. Luke, supposed to be written under the Apostle's superintendence, is unworthy of notice.

17-24. "Behold:" Instead of *ἴδε* many ancient authorities read *ἐν* δέ but if; and thus the Vulgate, *si autem*, which is followed by Wiclif and the Rheims. In this case the first part of the sentence, technically called the protasis, will extend to the end of the 20th verse, and the 21st will begin the latter part or the apodosis. The best critics prefer this reading, which is supported by most respectable external testimony, as may be

ναπαύη τῷ νόμῳ καὶ καυχᾶσαι
 18 ἐν θεῷ καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα
 καὶ δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα,
 κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου,
 19 πέποιθάς τε σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν
 εἶναι τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκό-
 20 τει, παιδευτὴν ὑφρόνων, διδάσ-
 καλον νηπίων, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρ-
 φωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀλη-
 21 θείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ· ὁ οὖν διδάσ-
 κων ἕτερον σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσ-
 κεις; ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν
 22 κλέπτεις; ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν
 μοιχεύεις; ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ
 23 εἰδῶλα ἱεροσυλεῖς; ὃς ἐν νόμῳ
 καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως
 τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις;
 24 Τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς
 boast of God, and knowest his 18
 will, and approvest the things that
 are more excellent, being instructed
 out of the law; and art confident 19
 that thou thyself art a guide of the
 blind, a light of them which are in
 darkness, an instructor of the 20
 foolish, a teacher of babes, which
 hast the form of knowledge and of
 the truth in the law. Thou there- 21
 fore which teachest another, teach-
 est thou not thyself? thou that
 preachest a man should not steal,
 dost thou steal? thou that sayest 22
 a man should not commit adultery,
 dost thou commit adultery? thou
 that abhorrest idols, dost thou com-
 mit sacrilege? thou that makest 23
 thy boast of the law, through

seen in Griesbach, and in other critical editions. The general sense in either case remains the same. In the one the reader's attention is called to the fact which in the other is hypothetically stated. 'Behold, thou are called a Jew, &c.; art thou therefore practically inconsistent?' Or: 'If thou art named a Jew and hast so many claims, and advantages, dost thou then that teachest another not teach also thyself,' &c.?—*Καυχᾶσαι* is the second person present passive, an unusual contracted form of *καυχάεσαι* put for the regular *καυχάη* or *καυχᾷ*. It occurs also in ver. 23, and is similar to *ὀδυνᾶσαι* in Luke xvi. 25. The best grammarians regard it as a form of the later common dialect.*—"Knowest his will:" The article in the Greek supplies the place of the pronoun and therefore there is no occasion for the use of italics. See Middleton on the use of the article, Chap. v. Sect. i. § 3, pp. 69, 70.—"Approvest the things that are more excellent:" The Greek admits another rendering, thus: 'distinguishest the things that differ:' and the translation of Tyndale agrees with this view: "hast experience of good and bad, in that thou arte informed by the lawe." Both have able advocates, who have appealed alike to Phil. i. 10, where the same expression occurs. Either meaning suits the context here and would well apply to the character described. But the former is better adapted to the context in Philippians, as a prayer for the approbation of what is best is more in character with the Apostle, than one for any degree of mental discrimination would be. The Vulgate has here *probas utiliora*, and in the other place *ut probetis potiora*.—"A light of them that are in darkness:"

* See Robinson's translation of Buttman's Greek Grammar, Sect. 103, iii. 1, note †.

breaking the law dishonourest thou 24 God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles 25 through you, as it is written. For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumci-	βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, κα- θὼς γέγραπται. Περιτομὴ μὲν 25 γὰρ ὠφελεῖ, εἰν νόμον πράσσης · εἰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμον ἦς, ἡ πε- ριτομή σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν. Ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαι- 26
---	--

Figurative for ‘a teacher of the ignorant and sinful.’ Comp. John viii. 12, i. 5. Matt. iv. 16.—“The form:” The Greek word expresses a mere appearance, a semblance, in opposition to the reality; or, a delineation, correct impression. In the former sense it occurs in 2 Tim. iii. 5, “a form of godliness,” in contradistinction to its “power;” that is, a show, pretence, without the reality. But here it describes some supposed advantage and superiority, and therefore must have the latter meaning.—Ver. 21 et seq. The interrogative construction is generally preferred in this and the following verses, and the particle “therefore” seems to be in favour of it. Olshausen prefers the direct address. Passages similar to these in sentiment may be found in Jewish writers. Koppe gives a few illustrations.—“Dost thou commit sacrilege?” Namely, by robbing God of his just rights and service. Comp. Mal. i. 7, 8, 12–14, iii. 8, 9. This is a much more probable meaning than that of plundering heathen temples, which has no historical support, and would hardly be introduced in such a connection.—Verse 24, refers to what is stated in several places of the Old Testament. See, among others, Isa. lii. 5, and Ezek. xxxvi. 20, 23.

25–29. These verses contain the same general thought as that in 12–16; and in this respect, may be compared with Heb. x. 26–31 and vi. 4–8. “For” is probably illative of the general thought before expressed and illustrated, namely, that the external advantages of the Mosaic law were of little or no worth, unless accompanied by an internal religious character.—Circumcision is put, by a synecdoche, for the whole Jewish system, or denotes a Jewish condition; and uncircumcision expresses a Gentile state or Gentiles themselves. An attentive reader will immediately perceive these different shades of meaning, and be at no loss rightly to attach them to the words.—The first three verses of this portion are regarded by the writers before mentioned as expressing merely supposable cases. I must repeat the remark before made, that on this theory the statements seem to me to be mere trifling. Nothing appears plainer than the meaning of the 26th verse: ‘If the Gentiles sincerely obey the law of God so far as it is known to them, they are just as acceptable to God as if they were Jews.’ And that a real, sincere, though imperfect, obedience is what is meant, and not a hypothetical perfect one, “which has never actually existed,” is proved by the next verse. For preposterous would it be to speak of Gentiles

<p> ὥματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσει, οὐχὶ ἢ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτο- 27 μὴν λογισθήσεται, καὶ κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου; </p>	<p> sion is made uncircumcision. There- 26 fore, if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not un- 27 circumcision which is by nature, if </p>
--	--

hypothetically keeping the law, and yet really condemning Jews for their transgressions. Or is the condemnation hypothetical too? This would seem necessary in order to preserve consistency, but would involve too great an absurdity to be maintained. Its meaning is made luminous by our Lord's language in Matt. xii. 41, 42, "The men of Nineveh, the queen of the South, shall condemn this generation." Here the original for "condemn" is the same word compounded with a preposition as that here translated "judge," and the preposition is often omitted without any diminution of the proper meaning of the compound word. It follows therefore that the keeping of the law in verse 25, is not an absolutely perfect obedience, but only a sincere one, although imperfect.

In verse 26, the word "uncircumcision" as first used, is the abstract for the concrete, and equivalent to 'the uncircumcised man,' and the pronoun "his," which follows the second instance of the word, has this intended concrete for its antecedent. "The uncircumcision that is by nature:" This may mean, the Gentile who is naturally uncircumcised. It must be granted that, in this case, the words "by nature" are unnecessary; still such adjuncts are not uncommon. Nevertheless there is undoubtedly force in Olshausen's remark, that the whole phrase is in evident contrast with the last clause of the verse, "by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law." He connects the words *by* or rather, of *nature*, ἐκ φύσεως, with the clause 'the uncircumcision that fulfilleth the law.' The whole idea will therefore be expressed thus: 'Gentiles, who of their natural condition, that is, without any direct revelation, live in accordance with the law of reason and conscience.'—"By the letter and circumcision:" Macknight remarks that "the common translation," which connects this phrase with the next, "makes no sense." He prefixes the words, "though a Jew," regarding "letter and circumcision" as a hendiadys, thus: "Judge thee, a transgressor of law, though a Jew by the literal circumcision;" that is, outwardly. But the meaning thus obtained is less forcible than one might expect in such a connection and from such a writer; and it requires the insertion of an expression, the omission of which is improbable. Διὰ, with a genitive, *by, through*, sometimes denotes *circumstance, state*, and may be expressed by, *along with*. Thus in 2 Cor. ii. 4, "with, διὰ, many tears;" v. 10, "done in his body," διὰ, in his bodily condition. Also in Heb. ix. 12, "not with the blood, but with his own blood," where διὰ is used twice. Closely allied to this is

it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly, neither *is that* circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly, and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and* not in the letter, whose praise *is* not of men, but of God.

Οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερωῷ, Ἰου- 28
δαϊσὶς ἐστίν, οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φα-
νερωῷ, ἐν σαρκί, περιτομή, ἀλλ' ὁ 29
ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ πε-
ριτομὴ καρδίας, ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ
γράμματι· οὐ ὁ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ
ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ.

the signification, notwithstanding, which it seems to have in Rom. xiv. 20, "who eateth with offence," *διὰ*, notwithstanding such result. Thus we speak of persisting *through* difficulty, that is, *notwithstanding* it; and this last meaning seems most appropriate here. "The letter" is best explained by 'the written law.' It is the law considered as "written and engraven," and the word is thus used in 2 Cor. iii. 6. The sense of the whole phrase may be expressed thus: 'notwithstanding the advantages of the written law and the Mosaic system.'

The general meaning of the three verses appears to be as follows: 'Judaism is indeed advantageous, if you live a religious life, in conformity with its moral precepts and spirit; otherwise your condition as a Jew is no more acceptable than that of a Gentile would be. If therefore the Gentile yield a sincere obedience according to his knowledge and opportunities, surely his Gentile condition will be regarded as favourably as if he had been a Jew. Yes, and this Gentile, if, with no other advantages than those of his natural condition, he lives a sincerely religious life, will rise up in the judgment and condemn you, who, notwithstanding the advantages of scripture and the Jewish religion, do nevertheless transgress the law of God.'

28, 29. "Spirit and letter" evidently denote what is internal and what is merely outward, somewhat similar to 2 Cor. iii. 6, where the same words occur for Law and Gospel: 'Circumcision does not consist merely in the outward rite, but chiefly in the inward character.' The spirit of the Jewish system promotes internal sanctification, of which the outward circumcision was a symbol. Comp. Jer. ix. 26. Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6. In Rom. ix. 6, the word Israel is once used to denote those of the lineal descendants of Jacob who were spiritual in character. Such are the genuine Israelites, (comp. John i. 47,) as here the true Jew is the inwardly religious man. The general thought in these verses may be thus expressed: 'It is not a scrupulous attention to outward rites, but an inward principle of holiness, which makes a man acceptable to God.'

SECTION IV.

CHAP. III.

JEWISH OBJECTIONS MET AND SINFULNESS PROVED. GENERAL CONCLUSION DRAWN.

<p>III. Τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰου- δαίου ; ἢ τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τῆς περι- 2 τομῆς ; Πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρό- πον· πρῶτον μὲν γάρ, ὅτι ἐπι- στεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ.</p>	<p>What advantage then hath the III. Jew ? or what profit <i>is there</i> of cir- cumcision ? Much every way ; 2 chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.</p>
---	---

CHAP. iii. There is a very close connection between this chapter and the preceding. There the Jews as well as the Gentiles are said to have broken God's law, sincere obedience to which is insisted on as a condition of his favour. In this the charge against the Jews is renewed, and proved by reference to the Old Testament ; and in this way the author returns to his main topic, and comes to the conclusion that neither Jew nor Gentile can expect justification by moral obedience.

Vs. 1, 2. After such a course of remark as pervades the previous chapter, distasteful as it must have been to prejudice, ignorance and vanity, it is quite natural for the Apostle to introduce a querulous objector starting the inquiries. Still, the form of the expression may be nothing more than his interrogative style. Comp. iv. 1, vi. 1-3, 15, 16, viii. 31-35, ix. 19-21, xi. 1, 2, 4, 11. In either case the general sense will be the same.—“ Every way :” that is, in reference to religion and morals.—“ Chiefly because that :” literally, ‘for indeed chiefly because.’ *For* may well be illative, as the general thought is, ‘they have much, for indeed it consists chiefly in this, that,’ &c.—In the following clause the word “oracles” is accusative, and the correct translation thus: ‘they were entrusted with.’ Wherever the original word occurs in the sense of committing or entrusting, the person is in the nominative, except in one case where the verb is in the infinitive ; and even here it follows another verb the nominative to which is personal. See 1 Cor. ix. 17, Gal. ii. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 4, 1 Tim. i. 11, Tit. i. 3. The term “oracles” is used in Acts vii. 38, for the divine law as received by Moses. It may here comprehend the whole revelation as contained in the Old Testament. The possession of this sacred treasure principally distinguished the Hebrews from all other people, and gave them spiritual advantages which could in no other way be secured.

3-8. The question before put is : What is the advantage of Judaism ?

3	For what ! if some did not believe,	Τί γάρ ; εἰ ἡπίστησάν τινες, μὴ	3
	shall their unbelief make the faith	ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ	
4	of God without effect ? God forbid :	θεοῦ καταργήσει ; Μὴ γένοιτο .	4
	yea, let God be true, but every	γινέσθω δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς	
	man a liar ; as it is written, That	δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, καθὼς	
	thou mightest be justified in thy	γέγραπται . ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς	
	sayings, and mightest overcome	ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσης	

to which an answer has just been given. The question results very naturally from the representation before made of the moral condition of the Jews ; consequently it stands in close connection with it. The author says, "some" Jews. He might have said *many*, but his delicacy of feeling leads him to spare his much loved nation. Comp. xi. 14. 'What if some, influenced by neglect and irreligion, or devoted to an external system merely, and regardless of the inward spirit of their law, have been faithless to God, and have rejected the true Messiah ; shall their want of faith destroy God's fidelity, that trustworthiness of his in which the fullest confidence should be placed ?' The word *πίστις*, which is generally rendered "faith," is often used to denote confidence, fidelity, trust, as shown by the connection in which it occurs. The sense of the verse, which is expressed in the Apostle's interrogative and forcible manner, is simply this : 'the irreligious unbelief of some Jews cannot, in the least degree, make void or diminish the fidelity of God which gives him a perfect claim to our faith and submission.'—The reader of the Greek will not fail to remark the paronomasia in the words *ἐπιστεύθησαν, ἡπίστησαν, ἀπιστία*, and *πίστιν*. This is a favourite figure with Hebrew writers.—"God forbid:" literally, 'let it not be.' The phrase is expressive of aversion, and is used in the Septuagint for the Hebrew word which is rendered in our English translation as above. Comp. in the Hebrew, Septuagint and English, Gen. xlv. 7, 17.—The following words may be construed thus : 'but let it be, God is true and every man a liar.' In this case, however, the Greek would most probably be, *μὴ γένοιτο· γένοιτο δὲ, &c.* The usual construction can hardly be improved. The verb is declarative, 'let God appear to be,' as in 2 Cor. iv. 7, "the excellency of the power may be of God," that is, 'may evidently appear to be divine.' The sentiment of the verse is plain : 'the fidelity of God must be maintained, whatever may be the consequence as respects every individual of mankind.' His truth is essential, and of course can never waver ; but man, weak, sinful, unstable, is always prone to error and falsity. The quotation is from Ps. li. (Sept. l.) 6, and corresponds with the words of the Septuagint. *Κρίνεσθαι* may be either middle or passive. If the former, the translation will be, 'when thou judgest ;' and if the latter, as in our English Bible, "when thou art judged," that is, when weak and arrogant man assumes to question the correctness of thy procedure. The

5	ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε. Εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησι, τί ἐροῦμεν ; μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν ;	when thou art judged. But if our unrighteousness commend the right- eousness of God, what shall we say? Is God unrighteous, who taketh	5
6	(κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω.) Μὴ γένοιτο . ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς	vengeance? (I speak as a man :) God forbid ; for then how shall	6
7	τὸν κόσμον ; Εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια	God judge the world? For if the	7

latter exposition agrees very well with the connection here, but would not suit that in the Psalm, the literal translation of which is, ‘that thou mayest be justified in thy speaking, (and) be pure in thy judging;’ and the parallelism requires the latter phrase to be equivalent to, ‘thy passing sentence.’

In ver. 5, the same objection is again resumed, although in a different form. The Apostle may intend to speak of man’s wickedness in general as being made to establish and recommend to a thoughtful creature the divine excellence. But, inasmuch as the language is put into the mouth of a querulous Jew, it may have arisen from statements of the Apostle himself, since he has asserted what such a one might represent as the ground of his fallacy. I allude to what the author elsewhere says, namely, that the rejection of the Gospel by the mass of the Jews became, in the providence of God, the occasion of offering it to the Gentiles. See ix. 23, and note there. The objector seems to have in view a charge of iniquity brought against the Jews on account of their unbelief. “God’s righteousness” is to be understood as before in i. 17. Professor Stuart indeed objects to this, that as “the Apostle (or the objector) is speaking of that attribute of God which is concerned with the judging and punishing of offenders, the retributive justice of God must be understood by” the phrase. But this does not follow, since God’s character as righteous judge would be equally impugned, whether the words express his attribute of justice or his plan of justification. Opposition to the one or rejection of the other must alike be followed by divine punishment. Still it is not improbable that both meanings may be merged into one, and the phrase express God’s righteousness as shown in his offering justification and salvation, through the Gospel scheme, alike to Jew and Gentile. There appears to be a sudden suppression of the sense, an aposiopesis, as the rhetoricians call the figure. The objection is commenced and suddenly interrupted by the Apostle thus: ‘If our irreligion and iniquity tend, as you say, to recommend and establish God’s method of justifying men through the Gospel—well, in this case, what shall we say? what is the right conclusion? that God cannot justly punish you for this faithlessness?’—“Taketh vengeance;” literally, bringeth wrath upon, equivalent to, inflicteth punishment. Comp. i. 18. He expresses his abhorrence of such a conclusion, since God is the righteous judge of the world.—“I

- truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory, why yet am I also judged as a sinner?
- 8 And not *rather*, as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say, Let us do evil, that good may come? whose damnation
- τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, τί ἔτι καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; καὶ μή, καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασί τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν· ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά, ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ; ὧν

“speak as a man:” that is, as men are accustomed to speak. This phrase is generally employed to mark what is weak, frail, erroneous, sinful, though occasionally it means, in accordance with sound reason, as a rational being. It is used in connection with conduct or character. Thus in 1 Cor. iii. 3. “Walk according to man,” (marginal reading, and Greek,) that is, as weak and sinful men feel and act; Gal. i. 11, “the Gospel is not after (according to,) man,” in character with human weakness and imperfection; 1 Pet. iv. 6, “according to men,” that is, most probably, according to their erroneous and sinful prejudices. It is also associated with some remark or argument. Thus in 1 Cor. ix. 8, “Say I these things as a man?” Are they my own weak and fallible statements, drawn solely from human observation and experience, and therefore but inadequately supported? And in Gal. iii. 15, “I speak after the manner of men:” Here the Apostle does not mean, as some have imagined, ‘I argue with you weakly and in a way adapted to your imperfect understanding;’ but, ‘I appeal to you as one reasonable man may properly appeal to another.’

The careful reader will have observed that the inspired author has not yet fully met the infidel Jewish objector. He has merely stopped his mouth, by asserting the unwavering truthfulness and fidelity of God in opposition to all human falsehood and faithlessness. He has merely said that the great judge of the world cannot possibly do anything but what is right. All this the Jew might grant, and yet renew his objection. And this he is made to do in the next verse. “The truth of God” is evidently identical with his faithfulness and righteousness before spoken of; and “my lie” is but a stronger mode of expressing Jewish impiety and wicked infidelity. The objection therefore does but repeat what had been before said: ‘If the perfect and true character of God become the better known by means of what you are pleased to represent as my false and wicked behaviour, why should I, who have become the occasion of advancing God’s glory, be considered and punished as a sinner, since it is admitted that through me God’s honour is augmented? The complete answer immediately follows. The principle on which the objection rests is that detestable one which justly condemns its advocates, that the end sanctifies the means: ‘We may do what is wrong in order to advance what is right.’ The Apostle speaks of this principle as one which was calumniously charged

<p>τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστι. Τί οὖν; 9 προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως· προη- τιασάμεθα γάρ, Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας πάντας ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν 10 εἶναι, καθὼς γέγραπται· ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς· οὐκ 11 ἔστιν ὁ συνιών, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ</p>	<p>is just. What then? are we better 9 <i>than they?</i> No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is 10 none righteous, no, not one; there 11 is none that understandeth, there is</p>
---	--

by some false witnesses against Christians. Various ways of analysing the Greek text have been proposed by the commentators. Some have suggested to supply *τί* before and *λέξωμεν* after *μή*, which gives this sense: 'and why may we not say, as we are slanderously reported to assert;' or, supplying *τί* before *μή*, and reading in connection with *ὅτι ποιήσωμεν*, the intermediate words being in a parenthesis, thus: 'and why may we not do evil to promote good.' The simplest construction seems to be as follows. After *μή* understand *ἐστί* and read the clause interrogatively, thus: 'And is it that, &c.? does it involve this conclusion?' Or, supply the imperative *ἔστω*, and make the sentence affirmative and imprecative, thus: 'And let it not be, (as we are calumniously charged to affirm,) that we may do' &c. The reader may find a similar method of bringing out a full reply to an objection in ix. 20-23.

9-18. *Προεχόμεθα*. If this be passive the natural translation would be, 'are we excelled?' which would not suit the context. In the middle voice the verb means to hold before one's self. It may also be used in the sense of, to offer a pretext. In this case, if it be connected with the preceding words thus, 'what pretext then do we offer?' the following would be a very unsuitable reply, for which we should rather expect the words, 'none at all.' If it be disconnected with what precedes, the translation will be, 'what then? do we allege any pretext?' According to either this or the former construction, it will not be easy to determine what the pretext referred to is. Probably, therefore, it is best to give the middle verb an active meaning, thus: 'What then? have we superiority? are we in a better condition?' Thus Theodoret, although he connects all the words so as to form one clause, "what advantage then do we possess?"* It is remarkable, however, that he has nothing corresponding with, "in no wise." Perhaps he felt that this reply would not suit the connection which he had adopted. But if we retain that which is generally received, the meaning which he gives to the verb is most appropriate. The Apostle has returned to the subject of justification, and his question is equivalent to this: 'What then? have we Jews any advantage over the Gentiles in pleading exemption from sin, and consequently in expecting to obtain justification by obedience?'

* On the Romans in loc., Opera, Paris. 1643, tom. iii. p. 30.

- 12 none that seeketh after God. They *ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν· πάντες* 12
 are all gone out of the way, they *ἐξέκλιναν, ἅμα ἡχρειώθησαν·*
 are together become unprofitable; *οὐκ ἔστι ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ*
 there is none that doeth good, no, *ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός.* Τάφος ἀνεωγ- 13
 13 not one. Their throat is an open *μένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν· ταῖς*
 sepulchre; with their tongues they *γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν·* ἰδὲ
 have used deceit; the poison of *ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν·*

“Proved:” The marginal translation, “charged,” is preferable. This is certainly the usual meaning of the Greek. Even if the other is admissible, it does not agree so well with the fact. The sinful condition of the Gentiles has indeed been fully exhibited in the first chapter, and as the author’s statements can be substantiated by abundant testimony, they may be regarded as proved. But he has not yet presented the same evidence of the delinquency of the Jews. He has accused them of practising the same vices for which they condemned the Gentiles, and the accusation was susceptible of undoubted proof; but he has not yet drawn out the evidence of their criminality. This he now proceeds to do. Thus he either sustains the charge before made, or, according to the other view of the word, confirms the evidence of guilt before implied, and it may be said, in a degree proved.—“Under sin:” that is, subjected to its domination, sin being probably personified, and regarded as an imperious despot. Comp. vii. 14.

The Apostle now proceeds to prove Jewish sinfulness by referring to statements made respecting the people in their own scriptures. The 10th verse in substance, and the following verses to the 19th even in language, are found in the Alexandrine copy of the Septuagint of Psalm 13, with this exception that *ὑπό* in verse 13 is added, and that St. Paul has put the sentiment of verse 11 in the form of an express negation, which in the Psalm is only plainly implied, the second verse of which contains precisely the same sentiment. It is possible that the words “there is none righteous, no, not one,” may be the Apostle’s own remark drawn from the passages immediately afterwards cited. On the third verse of the Psalm Jerome observes as follows: “From this verse on to that where it is said, there is no fear of God before their eyes, the Hebrew contains nothing to correspond. It is inquired, therefore, how the Apostle uses this testimony in his Epistle to the Romans. I reply that the testimony which he adduces consists of passages interwoven together from Deuteronomy, the Psalter, and other places of Scripture.”* He then proceeds to comment on the Psalm as it is in the Greek. Breitinger, in his edition of the Septuagint, after giving the passages at the bottom of the page, adds, “the scholiast remarks that all these are wanting in the Hebrew.” The probability is that they were appended to the Alexandrine copies of the Septuagint, in order to make them coincide with the Epistle, not that they have been lost from

* Opera, Edit. Mart. Paris. 1699, Tom. ii. Appendix, Col. 146.

14 ὧν τὸ στόμα ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας	asps is under their lips: whose	14
15 γέμει. Ὁξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν	mouth is full of cursing and bitter-	
16 ἐκχέαι αἷμα· σύντριμμα καὶ τα-	ness. Their feet are swift to shed	15
λαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν·	blood; destruction and misery are	16
17 καὶ ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν·	in their ways; and the way of	17
18 οὐκ ἔστι φόβος θεοῦ ἀπέναντι	peace have they not known. There	18

the Hebrew. They are taken from various places of the Old Testament; verse 10 is from Ps. xiv. (Sept. xiii.) 1 in the general thought; 11 from 2; 12 from 3; 13 from v. 9, and cxl. 3; 14 from x. 7; 15-17 from Isa. lix. 7, 8, and Prov. i. 16; 18 from Ps. xxxvi. 1. See Erasmus in loc., and compare the note on verse 3 of the Psalm in Bible de Vence,* Tom. vii. p. 390. This view suits the Apostle's argument better than that which supposes that they were all taken from one Psalm. For, by proving that sinfulness has in various ages been affirmed of the people or of great masses of them by their own prophets, he shows that it need not surprise them, if the charge is now renewed. It is too evident to require proof, that the specific charges here made are not intended of every individual. This is plain from the context of the original passages, and also from the fact that there are many to whom they would not apply. See particularly Ps. xiv. 4, where God's people are mentioned in contradistinction to those who in the former verses are spoken of as fools, corrupt, without understanding, having become filthy, ignorant and careless workers of iniquity. Immediately afterwards, too, these people of God are called the generation of the righteous and the poor whose refuge is the Lord. "Who will venture," says Morus,† in reference to such passages from the Psalms, "to understand them as of universal application?" The Apostle's description, like that which he gives of the Gentiles in the first chapter, is evidently only of general application. It ought, however, to be considered, that although St. Paul conducts his argument with reference to the people as a body, which was sufficient for his purpose, yet the inference which he deduces is certainly true of every individual of mankind, on all of whom sin may justly be charged, though not all the particular sins here specified.

The word "understandeth" in ver. 11, is like "knowing" in ii. 4, where see the note on p. 31.—"Open sepulchre:" This is a figure for a source of corruption, venting itself in filthy or injurious language and calumny.—"Way of peace:" that is, a religious course of life which brings along with it peace with God and one's conscience, and happiness both here and hereafter.

* This is a valuable Bible in Latin and French, with critical and historical notes, prefaces and dissertations, drawn from the works of Calmet, De Vence, and other distinguished French critics. The second edition was published at Paris, 1767-1773 in seventeen 4to volumes.

† Herm. Sac. tom. i. p. 257.

is no fear of God before their eyes. τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. Οἶδαμεν 19
 19 Now we know, that what things so- δέ, ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει, τοῖς
 ever the law saith, it saith to them ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα
 who are under the law; that every φραγῇ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς
 mouth may be stopped, and all the

19. The word "law" in this verse is first used for the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Comp. John x. 34, xii. 34, xv. 25, and 1 Cor. xiv. 21. Immediately afterwards it means the system of religion, or the dispensation embodied and delineated therein. The transition from the one meaning to the other is natural, and accords with analogy. The statement in the former half of the verse is evidently this, that the descriptions contained in the places quoted are intended of Jews. The quotations were certainly made in order to describe their general condition at different periods of their history; and, as there is no evidence to show that the author intended any farther application, we have no right to assume any other. The Apostle's remark may seem superfluous, as the citations are so palpably descriptive of the irreligion and wickedness of Hebrews. But national vanity and conceit would lead them to appropriate such statements to the despised Gentiles, as unworthy of the honourable descendants of Abraham. Some illustrations of the perversion of the plain meaning of Scripture may be seen in Jewish commentary on Isa. lii. 13—liii., of which I will cite one instance. Presuming the prophet's representation of vicarious suffering to be unworthy both of himself and his people, the divine declarations to this effect are most unwarrantably, and in opposition to the whole context, supposed to be uttered by ignorant Heathens. Thus David Kimchi on ver. 4: "This is what the nations will say: truly he hath borne our grief and such like, and is their own language." And on ver. 11, he remarks: "Thus far, the words of the nations; hereafter the words of God." To the same effect, Jarchi and Aben Ezra, although they do not express their meaning so definitely.*

"That:" or, so that. The particle introduces an inference from what has been before stated. If the latter half of this verse is applied exclusively to Jews, the language "every mouth" and "all the world" must be limited to them. And general expressions of this sort do occur in a restricted meaning, and this is always indicated by the context or nature of the case. But, in this instance, there is not sufficient reason for such a limitation. Although the words are intimately connected with the immediately preceding quotations, from which they are undoubtedly an inference; yet, they are probably intended to express also the result of all the preceding discussion; namely, that man in general, both Gentiles and Jews, are proved to be guilty, and can offer no plea to arrest the divine judg-

* See my Jewish Rabbies, Commentary on Isa. lii. 13—liii.: pp. 101, 112, 123, 142.

- 20 ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ. Διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμον οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ νόμον ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας.
 21 Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυ-
- world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of 20 the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.
 But now the righteousness of God 21 without the law is manifested, being

ment.—“Become guilty:” This must be understood declaratively, meaning ‘appear and be acknowledged to be guilty.’ Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 7.

20. “Therefore:” The conclusion is here drawn from the previous course of argument, and represented as one which is legitimate and incontrovertible: ‘by moral obedience no human being is justified.’ The connection makes it certain, that moral law is what is meant, not ceremonial, of which not a word has yet been said. Man is denoted by the term “flesh,” because it expresses him as he appears to be, and perhaps intimates also his frailty. It is here and often elsewhere employed to designate his whole being.—“For by the law is the knowledge of sin:” Koppe, who understands the word law here in the same sense in which it is first used in verse 19, explains this clause thus: ‘We know, on the contrary, that the sacred books themselves testify that all men are sinners.’ But the word *law* must have the same meaning as that in which it was just used, namely the perfect rule of man’s moral action, by virtue of obedience to which no man can claim justification in the sight of God. The connection between the former and latter clauses of this verse is too intimate, to allow us to go back, for the meaning of the term, to the first clause of verse 19. The Apostle here states with great brevity what he subsequently develops at large in the 7th chapter. The law awakens man to a proper knowledge of moral obligation, and to a suitable consciousness of his sinfulness. This is its legitimate province; to prepare the mind for a proper reception of the Gospel, rousing the man to a perception of his sins. It never was intended to become the ground or instrument of his justification.

21-26. “But now:” This is evidently a designation of time, and not merely a form of transition. It refers to the accomplishment of God’s purpose by Christ, and corresponds with “this time” in verse 26, while it is set in contrast with the period of “the law and the prophets.”—“Law” is used here in the same sense, and “God’s righteousness” also, as before. “The law and the prophets” is a phrase equivalent ‘to the whole religious dispensation of the Hebrews as embodied in the Pentateuch and the prophetic books.’ See Luke xvi. 16, with which comp. Matt. xi. 13. See also Matt. xxii. 40.—“Witnessed:” Here, as elsewhere, the word implies *favourable* attestation. Comp. Luke iv. 22, Heb. xi. 2, 39.—The meaning of the whole verse is as follows: ‘But now, in the Gospel, God’s method

witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, *which is* by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them

22 ροιμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν
προφητῶν, δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ 22
διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς
πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς

of justification without regard to law and not dependent on it, is clearly manifested, and the Mosaic dispensation does itself bear ample testimony to its truth and importance.'

The nature of this method is now more particularly stated. It is 'God's method of justification by faith in Jesus Christ.' The word *faith* is sometimes used for the Gospel system, this being its distinguishing characteristic, and very frequently for the principle in the mind of the believer. In the former sense it occurs in Gal. i. 23, iii. 23, 25, 1 Tim. v. 8; and in the latter too often to need reference. In this, also, it is very commonly used with the genitive of the object. See, among a multitude of instances, Mark xi. 22, "faith *in* God," Θεοῦ; Eph. iii. 12, "through faith *in* him," αὐτοῦ; James ii. 1, "faith of (*in*) our Lord, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν." Comp. the use of the word in the same chapter of James, vs. 5, 14 et seq. The idiom is the same as the Hebrew, and it occurs in Isa. liii. 11, "his knowledge," meaning 'a proper knowledge of him,' and frequently in other places. The former may possibly be its meaning here, and then the idea will be 'God's justification by means of the Gospel system.' But this is very improbable, as the author immediately speaks of *believers*, and both before and after of *faith* as the principle in the mind and heart of such.

"Unto all and upon all:" The three last words are omitted in several manuscripts and versions, while in many other authorities they are retained. As they seem to embarrass the sense, they were probably removed from the text by some ancient transcribers, who could not satisfactorily explain them. Thus it is easy to account for the omission, while for the same reason it would be difficult to explain the introduction of them; and consequently, the probability is in favour of their genuineness. Stuart considers the clause "*upon all them that believe*," as a kind of parenthesis, thrown in to guard against the idea that the actual bestowment of justification is as universal as the offers of it." But it is very improbable that the word *believers*, so necessarily associated with the leading thought, should be placed in any but a prominent position; and if this word is not parenthetical the others cannot be. It has been said that the Apostle varies his prepositions, without attaching to them a different meaning. This may sometimes be the case. But Gal. i. 1, which has been referred to as proof, is not at all in point, as there is the strongest probability that each of the prepositions there used has its own distinct and appropriate signification. Here *unto* may refer to the offer of justification to all, and *upon* to the actual gift of it to believers; or, as is more probable, the two prepositions

23 πιστεύοντας. Οὐ γάρ ἐστι δια- that believe : for there is no differ-
στολή· πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ence ; for all have sinned, and come 23
ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, short of the glory of God ; being 24
24 δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ justified freely by his grace,

and adjectives may be qualified by the word *believers*, and the meaning be, 'offered and given to all who possess the qualification of faith.'

Now, in accordance with one general thought which pervades the Epistle, namely, that the blessings of justification by faith are through the Gospel intended for all, the author remarks, that no difference is made between Jew and Gentile, for all are in the same condition, that of sinners. He does not mean that all are equally guilty ; it is enough for his purpose that all must be classed in the same category, that of sinners, and consequently such as have no natural claim to the divine favour, which they have failed to deserve and obtain.—“The glory of God :” That is, his approbation, and the happiness both here and hereafter which shall be bestowed on those who secure it. This corresponds with the meaning of the word in various places. See John v. 44, xii. 43 ; also Rom. v. 2, viii. 18.—“Being justified :” With the Greek participle, we may understand *οἱ ἐσσι*, who are, and translate both as a verb, or we may retain the participial construction. In the latter case, the most natural connection will be with the preceding verse, ‘all fail, or come short of God’s glory, being justified freely’ &c. In the former, the connection will be with ver. 22, the intermediate portion beginning with, “for there is no difference,” being parenthetical, thus : ‘all believers (who are) justified freely’ &c. This is the more probable arrangement.

“Redemption,” which is sometimes limited in its meaning, is here and elsewhere employed in its most extensive signification, comprehending complete ultimate liberation from sin and all its consequences. It occurs in the following places : Luke xxi. 28, here, Rom. viii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 30, Eph. i. 7, 14, iv. 30, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35 : In the last it is rendered in our translation “deliverance.”—“Freely :” Locke has a note on this verse which ought not to be passed over unnoticed. “Redemption by Jesus Christ does not import (that) there was any compensation made to God by paying what was of equal value, in consideration whereof they (were) delivered ; for that is inconsistent with what St. Paul expressly says here, viz. that sinners are justified by God gratis and of his free bounty.” It is true that sinners are so justified by God, but then it is also true, that this respects the payment of any compensation or equivalent by *them* ; and, moreover, whatever God chooses to accept may well be called an equivalent, and on this ground and also on that of its own sufficiency to effect the end in view, Christ’s sacrifice was eminently so. See an excellent note of Whitby on Heb. x. 14. Mr. Locke proceeds : “What this redemption is St. Paul tells us, Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14. ‘even the forgiveness

through the redemption that is in 25 Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his	χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃν προέ- 25 θετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς
---	--

of sins.' That redeeming, in the sacred Scripture language, signifies not precisely paying an equivalent, is so clear that nothing can be more. I shall refer my reader to three or four places amongst a great number, Ex. vi. 6, Deut. vii. 8, xv. 15, and xxiv. 18." With respect to the passages in the epistles, it is sufficient to say, that the effect is evidently put for the cause. As to the texts of the Old Testament, they all relate to the same fact, the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, and prove no more than this, that the word *redeem* is sometimes used in the sense of *deliver* merely, without any regard to its etymological force. With respect to the concluding remark in the note under review, "that if we will strictly adhere to the metaphor, the price paid must be to those from whom we are redeemed, viz. sin and Satan; (Tit. ii. 14, 'redeem us *from all iniquity* ;') and that the price could not be paid to God in strictness of justice, unless the same person ought to have the thing redeemed, (Rev. v. 9, 'hast redeemed to God,') and the price paid;" I consider the following as a sufficient answer. In Titus *iniquity* is plainly put for its effects, and these being under God's control, coming on the sinner through God's permission and as a just punishment, and removeable by means which God alone could adopt and carry out, the redemption-price (to use a figurative term which ought to be employed with suitable discretion,) may well be said to have been paid to God; and, inasmuch as God accepted it, may also be well said to have been satisfactory.*

"Set forth:" Wiclif has "ordeyned," and the marginal reading is "fore-ordained." The sense of purposed is given by several commentators, according to the meaning of the Greek noun in viii. 28, and the verb in Eph. i. 9. But the connection here, which speaks of God's *declaring*, *showing* his righteousness, rather favours the idea of publicity, as given in our translation.—"A propitiation:" The original *ἱλαστήριον* is properly an adjective agreeing with either *ἐπίθεμα* or *θῦμα*, cover or sacrifice, understood. In the former construction it is used for the golden cover of the ark on which the propitiatory blood was sprinkled by the high-priest on the day of atonement, whence its name, the Hebrew implying the idea of

* Wahl, in his *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica*, published at Leipsic, 1822, (from which Dr. Robinson prepared the first edition of his *Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Andover, 1825,) seems to have had in view some such objection as that of Locke, when under the word redemption, *ἀπολύτρωσις*, he speaks of Christ, by laying down his life, paying as it were a ransom, and adds in brackets, *Deo ne an diabolo?* characterising the question and not inappropriately by the term *inepte*. It certainly is not in character with that wisdom which is often associated with the name of Locke.

ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, righteous-
 διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγο- sins that are past, through the for-
 26 νότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ bearance of God; to declare, *I say*, 26
 τοῦ θεοῦ, πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δι- at this time, his righteousness;

covering over and of propitiating both. See Levit. xvi. 13–15, in Heb. and Sept. In Exod. xxv. 17, *ἐπίθεμα* is added to *ἱλαστήριον*. Our English translation uses the term “mercy-seat.” This may be regarded as a symbol of Christ, and he as our propitiation be denoted by the word. It has been objected that this exposition involves a confusion of figure, Christ being spoken of as the propitiatory or mercy-seat itself, and also in other places as the victim whose blood was sprinkled on it. To this it may be replied, that as the mercy-seat and the sprinkled blood were both typical of Christ, he may properly be described by either, as he is elsewhere represented as both priest and sacrifice. Still, it is well to avoid any such confusion of figure where it is unnecessary, and therefore *θῦμα* should be supplied, as is done by the best critics. The expiatory sacrifice of Christ will then be what the Apostle intends.

“Through faith in his blood.” The blood of Christ is put for his sufferings and death, as in v. 9, and various other places, all of which become frigid on any other principle than that of the atonement. It conveys more than the simple idea of death. It is death undergone as expiation, in accordance with Heb. ix. 22, “without shedding of blood there is no remission,” and therefore almost always used to express his death as atoning. The attempt of Taylor of Norwich to identify the meaning of “the blood of Christ” with his “perfect obedience and goodness,” certainly needs no refutation. The reader may see what this writer says in defence of his view by consulting his *Key to the Apostolic Writings*, sections 120, 121, 122, prefixed to his *Paraphrase with Notes on the Romans*, 4to. London, 1745. A construction which would connect this phrase with the word propitiation is too harsh to be admitted without very strong reasons, which in the present case do not appear. The atoning death of Christ is the object of the faith here mentioned. I have before remarked on ver. 22, p. 52, that the object of faith is frequently expressed in the genitive. This may be denoted as the first form. But others also occur. Secondly, the simple dative. See Matt. xxi. 25, 32, Rom. iv. 3, x. 16, Gal. iii. 6, 2 Tim. i. 12, Tit. iii. 8, James ii. 23, 1 John iii. 23, v. 10. Thirdly, the dative, with *ἐν*. See Mark i. 15, Gal. iii. 26, Eph. i. 15, 1 Tim. iii. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 15. These agree with the passage before us. I do not refer to 2 Pet. i. 1, as it is at least exceedingly doubtful whether “righteousness” is there the object of faith. Fourthly, the dative with *ἐπί*. See Luke xxiv. 25, Rom. ix. 33, x. 11, 1 Tim. i. 16, 1 Pet. ii. 6. Fifthly, the accusative simply. See John xi. 26, *τοῦτο* and 1 Cor. xiii. 7. Sixthly, the accusative with *εἰς*. See Matt.

that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in 27 Jesus. Where is boasting then? καιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ,
εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ
δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰη-

xviii. 6, Mark ix. 42, John vi. 29, 35, 40, 47, Acts xx. 21, xxiv. 24, xxvi. 18, Gal. ii. 16, Col. ii. 5. Seventhly, the accusative with *ἐπί*. See Acts xvi. 31, Rom. iv. 5. And lastly, *πρός* with an accusative. See 1 Thess. i. 8. These are all the forms that appear in the New Testament. Kuinoel considers *διά* in Acts iii. 16 as connected with *αὐτοῦ* *him* as the object of faith. But this is a mistake. *Διά* means *by* and indicates Jesus as the author of the lame man's faith. Its object is implied merely, not expressed.

"To declare his righteousness:" literally, for the showing of it. Commentators differ respecting the meaning of righteousness in this verse. As the Greek word is sometimes used in the Septuagint for *kindness*, as in Gen. xx. 13, some have given it that signification here, 'for the manifestation of his *benignity*.' And it has even been affirmed that, while strict justice and even severity is the prominent thought intended in ver. 25, kindness and favour are designated in the next. See Olshausen in loc. But this is an arbitrary distinction, and ought not to be assumed of the same term in so close a connection and introduced in so similar a way. In the New Testament the word is never used merely in this sense. The idea of kindness is sometimes implied, but some other properties necessary to constitute a sincerely religious character are always comprehended. And as the adjective "just" in ver. 26 has an evident reference to it, and is also as evidently antithetic to "justify," the same general meaning must be conveyed by the noun. This may be identical with that in i. 17, iii. 21, God's method of justification. This method is manifested by the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ through which sins are pardoned. But the most probable meaning is God's *justice*, which is so strikingly displayed to the world in the atoning sufferings and death of Christ in honour of the divine law violated by human transgression. His sense of justice in respect to that law is shown, in his requiring satisfaction in order that he might remit punishment. Thus he is able to be just, and yet to justify, that is, to pardon and acquit the believer. "That he may be," may mean, 'that he may continue to be;' or, probably, it is another instance of the declarative sense. Compare the conclusion of the note on ver. 19.—"For," or 'on account of,' "the remission of sins that are past." The marginal reading, "passing over," is more literal, but it implies what the other directly affirms. "Past sins" are, no doubt, those of former times, whether committed by Jews or Gentiles. Comp. Acts xvii. 30 and particularly Heb. ix. 15. "For the remission" &c. may be connected with the clause "faith in his blood," the intermediate phrase being thrown in parenthetically. Then the idea will be, that God hath set forth Christ as a propitiation, by faith

27 σοῦ. Ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις; It is excluded. By what law? of
 ἐξεκλείσθη· διὰ ποίου νόμου; works? Nay; but by the law of faith.
 τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί, ἀλλὰ διὰ Therefore we conclude that a man 28
 28 νόμου πίστεως· λογιζόμεθα γάρ, is justified by faith without the
 δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον deeds of the law. *Is he* the God 29
 29 χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. Ἡ Ἰου- of the Jews only? *is he* not also

in whose atoning sacrifice past sins, through the divine forbearance have been passed over, and consequently remitted. The idea in the parenthesis, being prominent in the author's mind, is therefore immediately expressed, and afterwards repeated as the engrossing thought, God's justice having now, through the Gospel plan, been conspicuously displayed, while at the same time he can, consistently with his moral character, justify the offender who believes.

Τὸν ἐκ πίστεως is equivalent to τὸν πιστεύοντα, the believer. It is like οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας ii. 8, the contentious, οἱ ἐκ νόμου, iv. 14, they that are of (meaning depend on) the law.—Πρὸς ἔνδειξιν in ver. 26 is evidently a resumption of εἰς ἔνδειξιν in the preceding one, and both are properly rendered in our English translation by the same phrase. In the former verse God's righteousness is said to be manifested in reference to the forgiveness of past sins through Christ's atonement; in the latter, by showing that now in the Gospel dispensation, he can be just and yet justify the believer. But the two prepositions may well be regarded as exactly synonymous, and the Apostle may vary his expressions without intending any change of meaning. We have an instance of this in the case of ἐκ and διὰ in ver. 30.

27-30. St. Paul, having shown that justification, or a state of acceptableness with God, is naturally unattainable by either Gentile or Jew, because of the sinfulness of both, and therefore, if attainable at all, can be so only through God's unmerited kindness, here declares what is now self-evident, namely, that human boasting or glorying is shown by the Gospel scheme of salvation to be wholly out of place. The word is probably chosen in allusion to the vain boastings of Jews in their superior advantages. See ii. 17, iv. 2; and compare v. 2, 3, 11, which appear to be in designed contrast to such objects of boast or rejoicing.—“Law” is equivalent to a system of doctrine. Compare Isa. ii. 3, “out of Zion shall go forth the law.” In analogy with this meaning, “judgment” is used in Isa. xlii. 1, 3, quoted in Matthew xii. 18, 20, for the religious system of the Gospel. It is this which, by setting aside man's justification on the ground of moral obedience and placing it solely on the ground of faith in Christ, removes all possible occasion of self-confidence.—In ver. 28 several authorities read οὖν, and others probably of more weight γάρ. If the former reading be adopted, the meaning will be, ‘we conclude therefore;’ if the latter, ‘for we argue,’ or ‘are per-

of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gen-
 30 tiles also: seeing *it is* one God,
 which shall justify the circum-
 cision by faith, and uncircumci-
 31 sion through faith. Do we then
 make void the law through faith?
 God forbid: yea, we establish the
 law.

δαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; οὐχὶ καὶ
 ἐθνῶν; ναὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν. Ἐπεὶ- 30
 περ εἰς ὁ θεός, ὃς δικαιώσει πε-
 ριτομῇν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυ-
 στίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Νόμον 31
 οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πί-
 στεως; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ νόμον
 ἱστάνομεν.

suaded, think,' expressive of the result of reasoning. The latter is preferable.—In ver. 30, "circumcision" and "uncircumcision" are abstracts for concretes, meaning Jews and Gentiles, as in ii. 26, and iv. 12. The prepositions *ἐκ* and *διὰ* seem to be employed in the same sense and for the sake of variety. They are both used in reference to the same topic, justification. See v. 1, Gal. iii. 24, and ii. 16. In the latter text both occur. As the first preposition is used in connection with the Jews, the phrase *ἐκ πίστεως* may stand in contradistinction to *ἐκ περιτομῆς* or *ἐκ νόμου*. See iv. 12, 14, and especially 16. The article connected with the latter *πίστεως* indicates that the faith which justifies the Gentiles is the same as that which justifies the Jews.

31. "Law" may here mean the Scriptures of the Old Testament, as the word is used in ver. 19. Then the sense will be this: 'Does this doctrine of justification by faith oppose the representations of the Scriptures? On the contrary, it is in unison with and supported by them.' And thus we shall have a very suitable introduction to the discussion in the next chapter, which shows that this doctrine was taught by David and exemplified in the person and history of Abraham. Stuart thinks "this exegesis quite plain." Still the Apostle may employ the term in the sense of the moral law, and affirm that his doctrine of justification, so far from subverting, does in reality sustain it. It does so, by showing its spirituality, and the necessity of vindicating its character in demanding a reparation of its violated honour; by making a knowledge of it requisite to convince a man of his sinfulness, and to bring him to receive the Gospel scheme by a living faith; and as this very faith recognises the moral excellencies of the law, it constantly regards it as the rule of life, and consequently establishes its obligation. These thoughts the Apostle afterwards more fully develops. See v. 20, vii. 7 et seq., Gal. iii. 24. Whether the author's doctrine can properly be said to establish God's law or not, depends upon the sense in which its establishment is to be understood.

SECTION V.

CHAP. IV.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH PROVED AND APPLIED BY THE INSTANCE OF ABRAHAM.

IV. τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; Ἀβραὰμ τὸν What shall we say then? that IV.
πατέρα ἡμῶν εὐρηκέναι κατὰ Abraham our father, as pertaining
2 σάρκα; Εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων to the flesh, hath found? For if 2

CHAP. iv. 1. This verse is susceptible of different shades of meaning, according to the punctuation adopted. It may be read continuously, as in our authorised version, which follows Tyndale, Cranmer, the Geneva and Rheims translations. Or the first two words may be separated from the remainder, thus: 'What then? shall we say' &c. And, with both these punctuations, τί may be rendered either *what* or *how*. But it is more in accordance with the style of the Epistle to put the interrogation point after ἐροῦμεν, thus: 'What shall we say then?' See iii. 5, vi. 1, vii. 7, viii. 31, ix. 14, 30. And Wiclif seems to have intended this division, if I may judge from Bagster's reprint in his English Hexapla: "What thanne schulu we seie: that abraham oure fadir aftir the fleisch foonde:" Grotius and Le Clerc adopt this punctuation. And it appears quite natural and probable, particularly as the Rabbinical formula, מַאי אֵיכָא לְמִימַר, what is here to say, (or to be said,) accords exactly with the Apostle's words. See Surenhusius, or Buxtorf's Hebrew Abbreviations under מַאֵל, p. 126, Basil. 1630, and Lexicon Chal. Talmud. et Rabbin., Basil. 1630, col. 81, top.—It having been proved that the Jew cannot claim justification on the ground of moral obedience, the Apostle very naturally inquires, what then is to be said or done? Is connection with Abraham to be claimed and appealed to? Did he find acceptance with God κατὰ σάρκα, according to the flesh?

The connection and meaning of these last words have also been the subject of no little discussion. They are often associated with Abraham, thus: "our father according to the flesh," that is, in the course of nature. But their position in the sentence will not allow this, and some old transcribers of manuscripts, feeling this difficulty, have unwarrantably altered the arrangement of the Greek. In addition to this objection, it may also be urged, that, on this exposition, the words are unnecessary, and add nothing to the sense; and, moreover, that, although they are often used of lineal descent, they never occur in reference to ancestry. It is not to be supposed that the Apostle would have used them merely to round off a sentence.

Abraham were justified by works, ἐδικαιώθη, ἔχει καύχημα, ἀλλ'
 he hath *whereof* to glory; but not οὐ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Τί γὰρ ἡ 3

They, most probably, designate something external, some supposed outward advantage, especially such a one as circumcision was thought to be. In this sense, the word "flesh" is not unfrequently used, as in Phil. iii. 4, where "confidence in the flesh" is illustrated by various external particulars of superiority which the author might claim over those possessed by many others. The prominent thought here is certainly that of Abraham's covenant relation to God sealed by the rite of circumcision. It may be allowed that, "in the immediate context, the Apostle is showing, not the inefficacy of circumcision to secure the patriarch's acceptance with God, but the inefficacy of his works in general."* This is undoubtedly true; and the quotation from the Psalm immediately afterwards made shows that it is the moral law which he there refers to, the breach of which required forgiveness. But although this is true of the *immediate* context, it is no less true, as appears from the subsequent verses, that the circumcision of Abraham is the point which he has in mind, and which he brings forward very prominently. I conclude, therefore, that the most probable meaning of the verse may be expressed as follows: 'Since all reasonable expectation of justification by moral obedience is cut off as well from the Jew as the Gentile, what shall we say? Shall we appeal to Abraham, our illustrious progenitor, and say that he found acceptance with God by any thing external, especially his circumcision?' Shall we thus attempt to support a claim to the divine favour?

2, 3. No direct reply to the question is given, but the negative is plainly implied. 'Certainly not, for if Abraham were justified by works he had what he might well boast of or rejoice in.' For the meaning of καύχημα see the note on Heb. iii. 6. The connection and bearing of the next words are somewhat uncertain. The meaning has been given by some thus, 'still his boast or rejoicing would only be before men. With God he would have no such right, as even then he would have done no more than his duty.' But it is not probable that such a case would be presumed, which in the present fallen state of human nature is not to be expected. If a *fallen* man could be supposed to claim acceptance on the ground of *perfect* obedience, it might well be a question whether he had not done more than his duty *in his fallen condition*, and consequently whether he had not a legitimate cause of rejoicing and self-gratulation. But such speculations are useless, and wholly inconsistent with the simplicity and practical character of St. Paul's mode of thinking and writing. Abraham, of course, had a right to challenge the honour of men; but in the point of his justification, he, like others, failed in that perfect obedience

* Tholuck, as translated from his early edition.

γραφὴ λέγει; ἐπίστευσε δὲ before God. For what saith the 3
'Αβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη Scripture? Abraham believed God,

which alone could give a claim with God. This meaning coincides with what immediately follows: 'the Scripture ascribes his justification to his faith.' See Gen. xv. 6. "It was counted unto him for righteousness:" that is, 'his faith was regarded as available to his justification.' Nothing but one's faith is ever said to be thus "counted" or reckoned. *For* does not mean *instead of*, implying that faith was substituted in the place of righteousness. It may be explained by *as*: 'his faith was regarded as justifying.' The Hebrew in Genesis has nothing to correspond; it is simply, "he counted it to him righteousness." In Ps. cvi. 31, we have a similar expression. There *for* is the translation of the Hebrew *Lamed*, which every tyro in the language knows is an idiomatic form of expression, and the omission of which would not alter the sense.

In his remarks on the subject of justification, the Apostle uses the following language, the meaning of which ought to be very clearly understood. He speaks of faith being counted or reckoned or imputed for righteousness, of God's imputing righteousness, and of righteousness being imputed. See vs. 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 22, 23, 24. The word righteousness in this connection is often explained of Christ's perfect religiousness, his holy and practical obedience to the divine law; and this is said to be imputed to the believer, that is, made over to him and regarded as his, by which imputation he is considered as having rendered a perfect obedience, although in reality it was rendered by Christ. Thus he is justified, the works of Christ being accounted as his. This is supposed to be what is meant by "God's imputing righteousness—that righteousness might be imputed;" that is, that Christ's moral obedience might be accounted as the obedience of the justified man in consequence of his faith. A careful examination of all the texts connected with this subject has compelled me to abandon this view, which for many years in early life I regarded as true and scriptural. There is no passage in this chapter where the word *righteousness*, *δικαιοσύνη*, occurs in this sense. It always means justification. Dr. Robinson says that "the righteousness of faith so reckoned to believers, is according to Paul the ground or occasion of their justification 'before God.'" Lex. under *δικαιοσύνη*, 2, b) β) (2), p. 184. I would rather say, it is their justification itself. Justification is one prominent topic of the Epistle, and particularly in this chapter. In the Greek the verb *justify* and the noun *righteousness* are radically the same, and the connection of both would have been better preserved, if the noun had been translated *justification*. Then we should have had in vs. 2, 3, *justified* and *justification*; so also in ver. 5, and *justification* in vs. 6, 9, 11 twice, 13 and 22. The word rendered *impute* means, to account or reckon to, to place to one's account, to regard as be-

and it was counted unto him for 4 righteous. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned 5 of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his	αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. Τῷ δὲ 4 ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογί- ζεται κατὰ χάριν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα· τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, 5 πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαι- οῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ
--	--

longing to. A due attention to the meaning of the two words, will, I think, determine that of every passage in the chapter wherein they occur. Thus, in vs. 3, 5, 9, 22, 23, 24, 'his faith was reckoned to him as justification.' Stuart indeed says on ver. 6, that this "makes no tolerable sense." But it makes a very clear and good sense. We may either regard the noun as the abstract for the concrete, justification for that which justifies; or as used for its instrument or condition, according to the terms of the Gospel. Then the language will be similar to that of 1 John v. 4, "this is the victory that overcometh the world, our faith," which evidently means that faith is the principle whereby the victory is gained: thus faith would have a similar relation to justification. In ver. 6, we may read, 'unto whom God reckoneth justification,' maketh it over to his account; that is, whom he regards as justified. In ver. 11, "the righteousness of the faith" is equivalent to 'the justification which is from faith;' and, "that righteousness might be imputed unto them also" conveys this thought, 'that justification might be accounted to them,' or regarded as theirs. In ver. 13, the promise is said to be 'through the justification which is of faith.' Hence it follows that, whether faith is said to be reckoned unto a man for justification or justification is said to be reckoned unto him, the idea is the same in each case; in the one, his faith is represented as availing to his justification; in the other, justification is represented as made over to him on the condition of his faith. But in no case is the obedience of another said to become his by imputation. The reader will do well to examine Whitby's discourse subjoined to 1st Corinthians. Commentary, fifth edition, Lond. 1727, fol. vol. II. pp. 217 et seq.*

4, 5. Verse four lays down a general principle, which would apply in this case were its application possible. In the next,—“him that worketh not” is emphatic. It implies that he doth not work with the view of securing his justification thereby; to obtain this he believes. In the language of the Homily on Salvation, “faith excludeth good works, so that we may not do them *to this intent*, to be made just by doing of them.” So in ver. 14, “they who are of the law” does not denote Jews merely, but Jews who depend on the law as the means of attaining the blessing referred to.—The

* I am aware that Mr. Haldane on iii. 21, affirms that “the word translated *righteousness* does not signify *justification*.” But the statements of this dogmatical writer are not always to be relied on, or his censures to be regarded.

	πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.	faith is counted for righteousness.	
6	Καθάπερ καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χω-	Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness with-	6
7	ρὶς ἔργων · μακάριοι, ὧν ἀφέ-θησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἔπεκα-	out works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven,	7

phrase "him that justifieth the ungodly" is not merely a periphrasis for God. It refers to him as the sinner's justifier, and the faith implied must act upon him in this character, and thus it becomes available to the believer's justification. So in ver. 24, "belief on him that raised up Jesus" comprehends faith in his resurrection, and consequently in all the important doctrines connected with it.

6-8. See Ps. xxxii. 1, 2. "Describeth the blessedness:" properly, pronounces or declares to be happy. Compare Gal. iv. 15, 'the felicitating of yourselves.' It implies a condition of happiness. This blessed condition is that of forgiveness of sins, which are not reckoned to the transgressor. David is said to describe the happy state of the justified man, and the quotation makes it consist in his having been pardoned. Hence two conclusions are evidently deducible; first, that this state of acceptance with God, which the Psalmist so highly eulogizes, is not the consequence of a perfect obedience, for it is the state of a pardoned sinner; and secondly, that justification and forgiveness of sins mean the same thing. In confirmation of the last remark, the reader is referred to the language of St. Paul in the synagogue of Pisidia. "Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Acts xiii. 38, 39. What is the meaning of being justified from things, but absolved from charges? The idea that justification, in the Apostle's view of it, is something over and above a state of forgiveness which comprehends, of course, what upon Gospel principles and promises belongs to such a state, is unfounded. The pardoned is also a justified man, cleared and acquitted of all charges which may at any time have been brought against him.

In order to illustrate the consistency of this view of justification with that of our own church, I annex the following quotations from the Homily on the Salvation of Mankind. "Every man of necessity is constrained to seek for another *righteousness of justification* to be received at God's own hands, *that is to say, the forgiveness of his sins and trespasses* in such things as he hath offended.—They which in act or deed do sin after their baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise *washed* by this sacrifice from their sins in such sort, that there *remaineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation*. This is that *justification of righteousness* which St.

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| 8 | and whosesins are covered ; blessed | λύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι · μακά- | 8 |
| | is the man to whom the Lord will | ριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς οὐ μὴ λογίσσεται | |
| 9 | not impute sin. Cometh this bless- | κύριος ἁμαρτίαν. Ὁ μακα- | 9 |
| | edness then upon the circumcision | ρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περι- | |
| | only, or upon the uncircumcision | τομήν, ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυ- | |
| | also ? for we say that faith was | στίαν ; λέγομεν γάρ, ὅτι ἐλο- | |

Paul speaketh of when he saith, no man is *justified* by the works of the law, &c. ; and again, we be *justified* freely, &c.—The sum of all Paul's disputation is this ; that if *justice* come of works, &c. And, as St. Peter saith, of Christ all the prophets do witness that through his name all they that believe in him shall receive *the remission of sins*. And after this wise to be *justified*" &c.—And, after quoting from St. Ambrose the words " without works, by faith only, freely we receive *remission of our sins*," the Homily adds : " These and other like sentences, that we be *justified* by faith only, we do read oft times in the best and most antient writers."—Afterwards we meet with this language : " In this matter of *forgiving of sin*—by Christ we have *remission of our sins* or *justification*." And in the third part of the sermon we have the following language : " Our own works do not *justify* us ; to speak *properly of our justification* ; that is to say, our works do not merit or deserve *remission of our sins*, and make us of unjust just before God ; but God of his own mercy through the only merits and deservings of his son Jesus Christ doth *justify* us. Nevertheless because faith doth directly send us to Christ for *remission of our sins*, and that by faith given us of God we embrace the promise of God's mercy and of *the remission of our sins*, therefore the Scripture useth to say, that faith without works doth *justify*."—It is undeniable that the Homily represents forgiveness of sins and justification as identical ; and the Homily expresses the doctrine of the Church of England.

9-12. In this portion of the chapter, the author shows that the happy state of justification of which the Psalmist speaks, and which Abraham had secured, is attainable by both Jew and Gentile on the same one condition of faith. " Circumcision" and " uncircumcision" are abstracts for concretes, meaning, as before iii. 30, Jews and Gentiles.—" For we say : " For is illative, and the language elliptical. ' Is this blessed state peculiar to Jews, or may it be attained also by Gentiles ? ' Then the idea implied is, ' by Gentiles also, as I now proceed to show ; for I say, ' &c. This introduces the argument, and is a formula common with the Rabbies. See Surenhusius, ubi sup. p. 12. Abraham's faith was available to his justification before his circumcision, and he received this rite as a sign and seal, (that is, as the words mean, an external attestation both to himself and all others who should know of its reception,) of his justification by the faith which he had before his circumcision. For this sense of seal, see 1 Cor. ix. 2,

γίσθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἡ πίστις εἰς
 10 δικαιοσύνην. Πῶς οὖν ἐλογί-
 σθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι, ἢ ἐν
 ἀκροβυστία; οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ,
 11 ἀλλ' ἐν ἀκροβυστία. Καὶ ση-
 μεῖον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς, σφρα-
 γίδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίσ-
 τεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστία, εἰς
 τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων
 τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυ-
 στίας, (εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ

reckoned to Abraham for righteous- 10
 ness. How was it then reckoned?
 when he was in circumcision, or
 in uncircumcision? Not in circum-
 cision, but in uncircumcision. And 11
 he received the sign of circumcision,
 a seal of the righteousness of the
 faith which *he had yet* being un-
 circumcised; that he might be the
 father of all them that believe,
 though they be not circumcised;

and John vi. 27. This is so plainly the Apostle's meaning, that it would be superfluous to add one word of exposition. Instead of the genitive "of circumcision" in ver. 11, several ancient authorities read the accusative. But this is doubtless a gloss introduced by some transcriber who did not understand the idiom. The genitive is exegetical. "The sign of circumcision" is equivalent to 'the sign, that is circumcision,' just as, in 2 Cor. v. 5, "the earnest of the Spirit" probably means, 'the Spirit who is the earnest.'—"The righteousness (justification) of the faith which:" The English and the Greek both are here ambiguous. *Which* may refer either to justification or to faith, and in either case the meaning be in accordance with the context. Professor Stuart thinks "that it should be referred to the compound idea designated by" both the words. The collocation of the article in the Greek favours the construction, 'which faith he had;' and its correctness is sustained by the concluding words of ver. 12, "that faith which he had."—"That he might be:" The original might be rendered, 'so that he might be.' But the common translation is preferable, as it gives a reason for this divine arrangement. Abraham's faith and consequent justification preceded his circumcision; and one reason for this was, that he might be the spiritual parent of all believers, even those who had not been circumcised. Διὰ, through, here has the meaning of notwithstanding, as in ii. 27.—In ver. 12, Koppe puts a colon after "father of circumcision." He considers all the rest of the verse as referring to the Gentiles. He is induced to adopt this view by ver. 16. But this makes a mere repetition of what had been said in the latter part of the preceding verse, where the Gentiles are plainly spoken of. It is better to regard this portion as referring to Jews, and as stating the condition without which not even they can claim spiritual connection with Abraham; namely, the imitation of that faith which governed the life and conduct of the patriarch. Jewish writers frequently speak of circumcision as a seal and sign, and of Abraham as the father of the faithful. See Tholuck in loc. The dative τοῖς immediately following the genitive περιτομῆς is an instance of that looseness of

that righteousness might be im-
 12 puted unto them also: and the
 father of circumcision, to them who
 are not of the circumcision only,
 but who also walk in the steps of
 that faith of our father Abraham,
 which *he had*, being *yet* uncircum-

αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην,) καὶ 12
 πατέρα περιτομῆς, τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ
 περιτομῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς
 στοιχοῦσι τοῖς ἰχνεσι τῆς ἐν
 ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς
 ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ 13

construction which is not unusual in Hellenistic Greek. Either case would grammatically connect with *πατέρα*.

13. As the idea conveyed in this connection by the expressions *law, circumcision, according to the flesh* or *what is merely external*, is in general the same, the Apostle continues his argument in reference to Abraham by the illative particle “for,” which, in this view, refers to what immediately precedes. Or it may be logically connected with ver. 10, thus: ‘as the promise was made to Abraham before he was circumcised, it was not by law, but by justification through faith.’

The first point of inquiry is the meaning and application of the word “seed” in this verse. Its usual meaning is progeny, descendants, subject however to such modifications and restrictions as the context in which it occurs may require. That here it does not embrace all Abraham’s descendants is self-evident; and the nature of the discussion shows that it does not even comprehend all his descendants through Israel. It must be limited to his spiritual progeny, the faithful. But in what sense can it be said, that to these a promise was made of being heir or lord or possessor (for this is the import of the Greek,) of the world? Some have attempted to limit the meaning of the word to the land of Canaan. Thus Schleusner under *κόσμος*, No. 5, and Wahl. 2, b) (β). But it never has this limited signification, and the texts referred to by these lexicographers as proof are wholly unsatisfactory.—Others consider the language as expressive merely of the vast number of Abraham’s offspring.—Others, of the dissemination and general extension of true religion, all believers being regarded as Abraham’s children. Macknight to this objects that “the inheritance was promised to Abraham’s *seed*” as well as to himself. If then by the *world* is meant the whole body of believers, they will be identified with the seed, which consequently becomes lord of itself. To this it may be replied, that the prophets often speak of the earlier spiritual descendants of Abraham, the former Israel, inheriting the Gentiles, that is incorporating them into Messiah’s kingdom along with themselves. See Isa. liv. 3, and Amos ix. 12, where the words “inherit” and “possess,” are translations of the same Hebrew term. Thus they are represented as taking possession of the converts to Christ, and in proportion as his kingdom extends in the world, Abraham’s spiritual progeny become lord of it. In this way the vast

νόμου ἢ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραὰμ
ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρο-
νόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου, ἀλλὰ

cised. For the promise that he 13
should be the heir of the world,
was not to Abraham, or to his seed,
through the law, but through the

number of this seed of the patriarch will be a prominent thought of the Apostle, which in vs. 15–17 he explicitly states.—Others again have regarded the expression as an amplification of the promises contained in Gen. xii. 7, xiii. 15, xv. 7, xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18, and xxvi. 4; or rather a development of their full meaning, as springing from the typical relation of the possession of the promised land to the enjoyment of the heavenly inheritance. See Heb. iii. 11, and note, pp. 57, 58. According to this view, it will relate to that universal empire, which was promised by the prophets to Abraham's posterity through the Messiah. Compare the texts just referred to in Isaiah, Amos, and also other similar places. In whatever light this empire was regarded by the Jews, it was no doubt spiritual in its nature, and involves the universal extension of the true church of God in its real moral and spiritual character.

But, in order to form a right judgment of the extent of meaning comprehended within the promise, it is necessary, as a second principal point of inquiry to examine carefully the parallel place in Gal. iii. 16, so far as relates to the same word "seed" as there employed. The Apostle declares that it is not used of "many but of one which is Christ." And yet most undoubtedly he does not mean to limit its signification to Christ personally and individually considered, but comprehends under the term all who are spiritually united to him, and thus constitute his "fulness." See Eph. i. 23. This is plain both from the discussion in Galatians, and from the last verses of the chapter: "Ye are all one (man, *εἷς*,) in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." His meaning is evident. The one seed or progeny of Abraham in contradistinction to the many, is Christ regarded as the head of his truly faithful members and therefore comprehending them, in contradistinction to the various races and classes of persons that sprang from the patriarch as their natural progenitor. This view of the subject is in harmony with the representation, which pervades the New Testament, of the intimate union of Christ and his true church. There is then no occasion to limit the natural comprehensive meaning of the words "heir (or lord) of the world." In reference to Christ they imply universal supremacy; in reference to Abraham or any individual member of the mystical body, they must be restricted to such blessings here and hereafter as belong to the individual by virtue of such connection.—When the Apostle says, that the promise was made through or by or in consequence

14 righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law <i>be</i> heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made 15 of none effect: because the law worketh wrath; for where no law 16 is, there <i>is</i> no transgression. There-	διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως. Εἰ 14 γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις καὶ κατήρ- γῆται ἡ ἐπαγγελία· ὁ γὰρ νόμος 15 ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται· οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις.
---	--

of the justification which comes by faith, the language shows that his mind rests on the blessings intended for Abraham and his spiritual progeny in general. In reference to Christ it would be inappropriate.—Expressions like that here used by Paul are employed by Jewish writers respecting Abraham. See Wetstein, Tholuck, Koppe, in loc.

14, 15. “They that are of the law:” This phrase is interpreted by some of “those who enjoy the privilege of living under the law.” So Stuart in loc. But, if this be the meaning, it must be modified by introducing, as the Professor does, the qualifying terms “only” and “without walking in the steps of Abraham as to faith.” It cannot mean simply Jews, all the pious and believing of whom were undoubtedly heirs. Most probably it describes those who were connected with and depended on the law; as in Gal. iii. 7, 9, “they that are of faith,” is equivalent to true believers, and in v. 24, “they that are of Christ,” to such as are really and spiritually united to him. Thus the Apostle’s remark is true and important. ‘If they who look for justification through the law whether ceremonial or moral, become thereby heirs of the heavenly inheritance, faith is superseded and useless, and the promise becomes good for nothing.’ This is a necessary conclusion, for the inheritance was originally “given by promise,” as the author expressly asserts in Gal. iii. 18. In the next verse he proceeds to state that this happy result of justification and heirship cannot come through law, which inflicts punishment on its transgressor. He then adds as a general principle, that transgression implies law and cannot exist without it; a principle which the Apostle elsewhere lays down in other terms, (see v. 13 and vii. 8,) and which is true in its most unlimited extent, although he may not always intend an unlimited application.

16, 17. “Therefore:” This may mean, either consequent upon or consistently with what has been said. The benefit referred to comes by faith, and thus is according to favour. The *ἵνα* is most likely ecbatic and not telic; in other words, it rather expresses the fact than the direct intention. With *κατὰ χάριν* compare ver. 4. Now follows the reason why the benefit comes by faith, namely, that the promise, meaning the blessing promised, might be secured to the whole seed, that is, the whole body of Abraham’s spiritual progeny, the faithful, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. The word *only* plainly implies, that the portion of “the seed which is of the law” is regarded by the Apostle as secure of the accomplishment

<p>16 Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι, οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὃς 17 ἐστὶ πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν, (καθὼς</p>	<p>fore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father</p>
---	--

of the promise; and therefore the phrase "of the law" cannot have exactly the same meaning here as in ver. 14, but must denote Jewish believers. These are a part of the patriarch's spiritual progeny, and are here placed in contradistinction to the Gentile believers, expressed by the next clause, "but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham." The word *also* marks something additional to what had just been said, and therefore the clause containing it must be understood with such limitation; otherwise it might be regarded as expressive of Jewish and Gentile believers. All these are comprehended within the terms of both the clauses, and Abraham is represented as the spiritual father of all the faithful. The meaning may be expressed thus: 'To the entire holy progeny, not to that portion of it only who are Jews, participating in the benefits of the law, but to those also who, although they have not the law, possess the same principle of faith which Abraham had.' As applicable to this last statement, the Apostle quotes from Gen. xvii. 5: "I have made thee a father of many nations." It is true that this was a promise of numerous posterity, who should establish themselves as various nations in the earth. But there is no reason to limit the promise to this meaning. It does not preclude a reference to the patriarch's numerous spiritual progeny, and in this latter sense does St. Paul apply it. The first part of the 17th verse, including the quotation, should be placed in a parenthesis, and the words that follow read in connection with the last clause of the 16th, thus: "Who is the father of us all before God in whom he believed." This makes a clear and intelligible sense: however Abraham may be regarded by the Jews or by men in general, in the view of God he is the spiritual father of all believers, Gentiles as well as Jews. "Κατέναντι οὐ ἐπίστευσε θεοῦ, by attraction for κατ. θεοῦ ᾧ ἐπίστευσε." Robinson under the first word. The description now given of God as he who quickeneth, &c., may refer to the extraordinary birth of Isaac in the extreme old age of his parents, (see ver. 19,) and also to the state in which the Gentiles are said to have been before their conversion to the Gospel contrasted with their subsequent condition. See 1 Pet. ii. 10. But undoubtedly it is also a description of God's majesty, drawn from his power as exercised in creation and resurrection. Ὡς ὄντα may be equivalent to εἰς τὸ εἶναι, so as to be, and then the meaning will be, who commands what does not exist to come into being. But as the language is antithetic, things that are not

- 17 of us all, (as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, *even* God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not
 18 as though they were. Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be.
 19 And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about a hundred years old, neither yet the
 20 deadness of Sarah's womb; he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God,
 21 and being fully persuaded that what he had promised, he was
 22 able also to perform. And there-
- γέγραπται· ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε,) κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσε θεοῦ, τοῦ ζωοποι- οῦντος τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ κα- λοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. "Ὅς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι 18 ἐπίστευσεν, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐ- τὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου· καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας 19 τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυ- τοῦ σῶμα ἥδη νενεκρωμένον, ἑκα- τονταέτης πού ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάρρας, εἰς 20 δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ πληροφορη- 21 θείς, ὅτι ὁ ἐπήγγελται, δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι. Διὸ καὶ ἐλο- 22 γίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

and things that are most probably denote also what is comparatively of no worth and importance, and what is most valuable and distinguished.

18–21. “Against hope:” that is, against all human and ordinary probability, in view of the advanced age of himself and his wife, and their heretofore childless condition.—“So shall thy seed be:” Gen. xv. 5. This is an imperfect quotation, a method of citing the Old Testament very usual with Jewish writers. See Surenhusius, p. 49, and Aben Ezra in Jewish Rabbies, p. 139 with note §. The comparison is with the stars, which, as well as the sand, were used to express vast multitudes. Οὐ κατενόησε, “he considered not:” Two very important manuscripts, the Syriac and Coptic versions, and some other authorities omit the negative particle. Olshausen defends the omission, which he says gives to δέ in ver. 20 its proper meaning. In this case, the Apostle’s representation will be that Abraham with full consideration of the natural difficulties attendant on the fulfilment of the divine promise, nevertheless did not in the least distrust it. If the negative be retained, the patriarch will be represented as disregarding all the difficulties though fully seen and appreciated, in consequence of the living character of his faith.—“Staggered not:” did not hesitate at or waver respecting.—“Able:” God’s willingness is, of course, implied as an object of Abraham’s faith.

23–25. That Abraham’s faith became available to his justification was not recorded in Scripture merely to eulogize the patriarch, but to give us

23 Οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι' αὐτὸν μόνον, fore it was imputed to him for
 24 ὅτι ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' righteousness. Now it was not 23
 ἡμᾶς, οἷς μέλλει λογίζεσθαι, τοῖς written for his sake alone, that it
 πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα was imputed to him; but for us 24
 Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νε- also, to whom it shall be imputed,
 25 κρῶν· ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παρα- if we believe on him that raised up
 πτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ Jesus our Lord from the dead; who 25
 τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν. was delivered for our offences, and
 was raised again for our justifica-
 tion.

believers in all future ages comfort and encouragement. Thus in Bereshith Rabba,* it is said: "What is written for Abraham is written also for his children." So also Philo. The faith which is referred to in ver. 24, implies belief in the resurrection of Christ and all the doctrines necessarily connected with it, his death as an atonement for our sins, and his liberation from the grave as securing our acceptance with God and its consequent blessings.

SECTION VI.

CHAP. V. 1-11.

THE HAPPY CONSEQUENCES OF A STATE OF JUSTIFICATION.

V. Δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως, Therefore being justified by V.
 εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν faith, we have peace with God
 διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χρισ- through our Lord Jesus Christ: by 2
 2 τοῦ, δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν whom also we have access by faith
 ἐσχήκαμεν τῇ πίστει εἰς τὴν into this grace wherein we stand,
 χάριν ταύτην, ἐν ᾗ ἐστήκαμεν, and rejoice in hope of the glory of

CHAP. v. The Apostle has shown that mankind being all sinners, cannot expect justification by obedience, and must obtain it only through faith, which secures this blessing to Gentiles as well as to Jews: Chaps. i. ii. iii. He has proved also that this doctrine was not at all novel, as it is recognised in the language of David, and also in the history of Abraham, from which it is evident that his justification was by faith, and previously to his circumcision: iv. He now proceeds to trace the effects flowing from justification by faith.

1-5. "Being justified:" More accurately, 'having been justified,' imply-

* That is, the great Bereshith, an old Rabbinical Commentary on Genesis.

3	God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience;	καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ. Οὐ μόνον δέ, 3
4	and patience, experience; and ex-	ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδότες, ὅτι ἡ θλίψις
5	perience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given	ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ 4 ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα, ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ κατασχύ- 5 νει· ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέ-

ing also a continuance in this condition.—The words “by faith,” in ver. 2. are wanting in some ancient authorities, although the evidence is decidedly in their favour. They were probably omitted by certain transcribers who thought them tautological. But the desire of the Apostle to make faith as prominent as possible, would prompt him to introduce it here.—“This grace:” In other words, this gracious condition of acceptance.—“Rejoice:” So the same original word should have been translated in vs. 3, 11, where our English version has “glory” and “joy,” according to its frequent usage of employing a variety of expressions where the original is the same. See note on Heb. xii. 28, p. 177, 178.

The first part of ver. 2 may be parenthetical. If so, the last, “and rejoice in hope of the glory of God,” will express the second happy result of justification. Or, access through Christ by faith may be the second, and rejoicing the third. Some prefer the former, thinking it to agree better with the position of the copulative. The noun is used in Heb. iii. 6, where see the note. As the Jew rejoiced in his connection with Abraham, in his circumcision and covenant relation to God, the Apostle represents the Christian as rejoicing in his hope of future glory, and in those means and instrumentalities which are intended to facilitate his attainment thereof.—*Δοκιμὴν* in ver. 4, is rendered in our translation, “experience;” and so by Tyndale, Cranmer, and Luther, and in the Geneva version. Wiclif has “provyng” and the Rheims “probation.” The word means trial, proof, and here most probably implies the result of trial, a character firm and consistent, well tried and proved. See Phil. ii. 22.

“Hope maketh not ashamed:” The meaning is, it does not disappoint those who cherish it, or put them to shame as if they had indulged in a vain expectation. Comp. ix. 33, x. 11, which are cited from the Septuagint of Isa. xxviii. 16.—“The love of God:” That is, according to the general signification of the phrase, God’s love to us. See on viii. 35. Here it is used as a metonymy of the cause for the effect, meaning the result of God’s love. The effusion of the Holy Spirit here spoken of refers chiefly to his ordinary influences abundantly dispensed to believers, although it may comprehend also the miraculous powers imparted by him. The language, “in our hearts,” shows that the Apostle’s mind dwells principally on the

χυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ
 πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος
 6 ἡμῖν. Ἐτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων
 ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ
 7 ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανε. Μόλις γὰρ
 ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται·
 ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις
 8 καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν. Συνίστησι
 δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς
 ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄν-

unto us. For when we were yet 6
 without strength, in due time
 Christ died for the ungodly. For 7
 scarcely for a righteous man will
 one die; yet peradventure for a
 good man some would even dare to
 die. But God commendeth his love 8
 towards us, in that, while we were

general distributions of grace. The word *ἐκχέω* would be quite suitable in either case. See Acts ii. 17, 18, 33, x. 45, and Tit. iii. 6.

6. Ἐτι at the commencement of the verse is no doubt the true reading. Some ancient authorities have *εἶγε*, some *εἰ γάρ*, and some *εἰς τί*. The adoption of any one of these readings may have led to the introduction of the *ἔτι* after *ἀσθενῶν* which Griesbach has admitted into the text with the mark of good authority.* It must be acknowledged that it embarrasses the meaning, and Knapp, Hahn and Olshausen reject it. Tholuck suggests various ways of explaining it, all of which are somewhat harsh, and is inclined to regard it as a gloss. If admitted, it seems best to consider it as a repetition of the first *ἔτι* introduced to make the statement of our natural feeble condition the more emphatic. "Weak" evidently means, destitute of spiritual strength.—"In due time" qualifies the words that follow. See Gal. iv. 4, 5, "when the fulness of the time was come," &c.

7, 8. These verses express the marked difference between the highest degree of love shown by any man to his fellow, and that of God and Christ to us. There is some difficulty in determining the right connection of the two clauses in ver. 7, and also in settling the true meaning of the words *righteous* and *good*. The connection adopted by our translators makes the latter clause somewhat parenthetical, though it serves to heighten the force of the former. The sense is clear, but the Greek will hardly bear such a translation, as the second *γάρ* cannot be expressed by "yet." The difficulty arising from this particle is probably the cause of its having been in a few unimportant manuscripts entirely omitted, as it is also in the translations of Tyndale and Cranmer. Wiclif has:† "vnnethis (scarcely) dieth ony man for the just man, and zit for a good man: perauenture summe man dare die;" the Geneva has: "but for a good man," &c. The Rheims is more accurate than either, translating *γάρ* *for* in both cases, which is most probably correct. Each clause is in contradistinction to what follows, and either

* The reader will find an explanation of Griesbach's most important critical marks in my brief analysis of his Prolegomena, contained in the Translation of Planck's Introduction to Sacred Philology and Interpretation, pp. 254-257.

† I quote from Bagster's English Hexapla.

yet sinners, Christ died for us. τῶν ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
 9 Much more then, being now justifi- ἀπέθανε. Πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον 9
 ed by his blood, we shall be saved δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι
 10 from wrath through him. For, if αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ
 when we were enemies, we were ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς. Εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ 10
 reconciled to God by the death of ὄντες καταλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ
 his Son, much more, being re- τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ,
 conciled, we shall be saved by his πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες

would make a sufficient antithesis independently of the other. Raphel remarks* that the Greek writers make a distinction between *δίκαιος* and *ἀγαθός*, understanding by the former an upright man, one who obeys the laws, gives to every one his due, and does no injury; and by the latter, one who does not confine his action and deportment within the literal requisition of the law, but with the feeling of habitual benevolence, does all the good in his power to his fellow creatures. Vorst† considers *δίκαιος* as equivalent to the Hebrew word צַדִּיק generally translated in our English *just* or *righteous*, meaning a religious and good man, and *ἀγαθός*, which immediately follows, as synonymous and explanatory. But it is not at all probable, that St. Paul would inadvertently introduce two such clauses without attaching a definite meaning to each, or that he would intentionally use both as precisely equivalent; and therefore the meaning of the two words cannot be regarded as identical. In the latter there is a climax. The one denotes a righteous man, a person really good and religious, conducting himself uprightly towards man and humbly towards God; the other describes the same character, marked also by a benevolent, self-sacrificing disposition, which inclines him to acts of benevolence and kindness, by which he becomes distinguished. In this sense the word is used in Matt. xx. 15: "Is thine eye evil (envious) because I am *good*," not merely *just*, but benevolent and liberal? The Apostle seems to have begun his antithesis with the first character in his mind; then suddenly to have stopped short, and by a beautiful correction, as I may say, or amplification of his meaning, to have introduced the second, thus: 'For scarcely for a righteous man will any one die:—for for the good man, whose heart, filled with divine love, prompts him to benefit his fellow creatures by constantly doing good, some one perhaps will even venture to die; but God establisheth and recommendeth his own love to us, in giving Christ to die for us while we were yet sinners unworthy of his kindness.' Comp. John iii. 16.

9–11. 'Much rather, therefore, having now been justified by his blood: That is, having been pardoned and accepted by God through his atoning

* Annotationes Philologicæ in Novum Testamentum ex Xenophonte, et cæt., 8vo, tom. ii. p. 252.

† De Hebraismis Nov. Test., 8vo. Edit. Fischer; Lips. 1778, pp. 55, 56.

σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. life. And not only so, but we also 11
 11 Οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώ- joy in God, through our Lord Jesus
 μενοι ἐν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Christ, by whom we have now re-
 ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ νῦν ceived the atonement.
 τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν.

sufferings and death. See iii. 25, iv. 6-8, and notes, pp. 55, 63, 64.—
 “Enemies:” See viii. 7, which shows that the enmity referred to develops
 itself in hostility to God’s law.—“Through his life:” meaning doubtless,
 his glorious life in heaven, where he acts as our permanent intercessor.
 See John xiv. 19, and note on Heb. vii. 25, pp. 98, 99.—“Not only:”
 This refers to what had been before said in vs. 2, 3, and is sufficiently ex-
 plained in the analysis.—“Received the atonement:” Rather, as it is in
 the margin of our English Bibles, “reconciliation:” In other words, have
 been reconciled. See Robinson’s Lexicon under λαμβάνω, 1. f) and 2. e).

SECTION VII.

CHAP. V. 12-21.

COMPARISON OF THE RESULTS OF ADAM’S FALL WITH THOSE OF CHRIST’S REDEMPTION.

THIS section has been the occasion of much critical and theological discus-
 sion. To examine it thoroughly, investigating the various theories both
 exegetical and dogmatic which have been applied to or supposed to be
 founded on it, would require a volume. The reader of this commentary
 must not therefore be disappointed, if he finds nothing more than a brief
 notice of the prominent exegetical and theological points necessary to be
 kept in view in attempting to elicit the Apostle’s meaning. I have endeav-
 oured to state the purport of this as well as the other parts of the Epistle,
 independently of any doctrinal bias arising merely from education or asso-
 ciation. It seems to be the design of St. Paul to show that, as the
 lamentable effects of the fall extended more or less to all mankind, so do
 the benefits of the atonement, from the blessed results of which Gentiles
 were no more excluded than Jews. As he had never had an opportunity
 of orally instructing the Roman Christians, he avails himself of occasions
 which his subject suggested, to enlarge on the more prominent points of
 the Gospel. The idea of our being reconciled to God through Jesus Christ
 expressed in the former part of the chapter, may have suggested to him an

12 Wherefore, as by one man sin Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ δι' ἐνὸς ἀν- 12

amplification of the statement, and have led him to draw a parallel between the benefits which we may thus receive and the injury which we sustained by the fall of Adam. It is undoubtedly true that condemnation through the one and justification through the other is a prominent part of the comparison. The statement of Professor Hodge may well be admitted, "We are condemned on account of what Adam did, we are justified on account of what Christ did." But this is not the whole scope. The language is more comprehensive. It is evidently designed to set in contrast the general evils sustained by all men in consequence of their connection with Adam, with the general benefits procured for all men by virtue of their connection in a greater or less degree with Christ. In this view, the contents of the section harmonize with the scope of the whole Epistle. They tend to place in a clear light these two points; that justification is not of human obedience but of God's favour through Christ, and that this blessing with the happiness attendant upon it is designed for all.

12. "Therefore:" Some commentators connect this word with the preceding verse. Among them is Macknight, who paraphrases thus: "Our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom we have received the reconciliation, for this reason, as through one man sin entered," &c. He adds in support of this arrangement: "For the Apostle is giving a reason why all have received reconciliation through Jesus Christ." But, not to urge that such a connection of "therefore," διὰ τοῦτο, is very unusual, it is evident that if this had been the Apostle's intention, he would have introduced the word *all* in the 11th verse, in order to show that he meant his statement there to have a general application. Whereas it is certain from the whole preceding part of the chapter, that he is speaking exclusively of justified Christians. It is best to retain the usual punctuation. The formula, "therefore," may be explained in reference to what follows, namely, the statement that the blessings derived from Christ counterbalance at least the evils entailed from Adam. As observation and experience assure us of the one, therefore has God graciously provided us with the other. Thus the same expression in John vii. 22, though standing at the beginning of the sentence, has most probably its logical connection with the remark that circumcision was performed on the Sabbath day, which is made at the end of it. Or else the phrase may have a retrospective reference to the whole preceding discussion, thus: *According to* what has been already stated and consistently with the views before given. Thus it occurs in Matt. xiii. 52, immediately after and in close connection with certain very instructive parables and their interpretation: "*Therefore*, every scribe," &c.

"By one man:" that is, Adam. The first father of the human family is mentioned rather than the mother, because she may be regarded as asso

θρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον entered into the world, and death

ciated with him; and also on account of the parallel intended to be drawn between him and Christ, as is done also in 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45–49.

“Sin entered into the world.” The word *sin* in the Bible generally expresses *the act* or *habit of sinning*, as every reader must have observed; but it is also employed in the sense of *sinfulness*, that is, the tendency, disposition, quality or element in fallen man, which of its own nature produces in our present imperfect condition those acts or habits. Thus we find it used in vii. 8, 9, 11: “Sin wrought in me concupiscence—sin was dead—sin revived—sin deceived me and slew me.” And so also in vs. 13, 14, 17, 20. It would be quite preposterous to understand *sin* in these places as *the act of sinning*. And so 1 John iii. 4, simply means that sin is what is at variance with law: ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. It may be predicated of a tendency or quality in a responsible agent as well as of any overt act. Therefore the word in the text under consideration is plainly susceptible of the same signification, which seems also to be best adapted to the context. On this supposition then, the Apostle’s first proposition will run thus: By one man, Adam, sinfulness, moral depravity, entered into the world. This must of course embrace the necessary results of such depravity, appearing in responsible agents under the form of positive sins. It seems best, therefore, to give to the word here the most extended meaning, comprehending both sinful tendency and action.

The next proposition states the direct consequence of this depravity, so acting, namely, death. We are so in the habit of associating the idea of death with that of the separation of soul and body, the meaning which in common parlance is attached to the word, that unconsciously we identify the one with the other. And there can be no reasonable doubt, that the idea of this physical death, and all the evils producing and connected with it, is prominent in the Apostle’s mind. The language of the original sentence, “dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return,” which is explanatory, at least in part, of the threat “thou shalt surely die,”* would seem to determine this point. And the evident appeal which he makes in ver. 14, to what every one knew to be the fact, namely, that “death had reigned from Adam to Moses,” settles it most conclusively. Still, this will not prove that the meaning is to be limited to the mere separation of the soul from the body. Nothing is more certain, than that the Scriptures employ the word in a much more extended signification. It denotes the miseries of a state of condemnation, comprehending banishment from the enjoyment of God’s presence, and positive punishment inflicted; and thus it is set in contradistinction to life and blessedness with God. In connection with this idea more or less clearly developed, it is used to express misery

* Gen. iii. 19, ii. 17.

by sin ; and so death passed upon *εἰσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*

and wretchedness in general, and the corresponding word *life* to denote happiness. Thus in Deut. xxx. 19, "I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing;" in Prov. xii. 28, "in the way of righteousness is life, and in the pathway thereof there is no death:" and in 1 John iii. 14, "we have passed from death unto life." See also Prov. xi. 19, John viii. 21, 24, 51. And this general idea of misery is most probably the true meaning of the word in this text. It certainly cannot be limited to physical death, for from this the Christian is not liberated; nor can it exclude this with its necessary adjuncts, for the reasons before assigned. Neither is it expedient to endeavour to determine the degree of the misery and punishment denoted. It is sufficient that sin and death are naturally and necessarily connected. The one follows the other as its attendant shadow, dark and malignant. This then is the tenour of the second proposition; through moral depravity, developing itself in actual sins and entailed on human nature by the fall of Adam, came human misery, physical and spiritual.

The latter half of the verse repeats the two propositions in a somewhat different manner, with some amplification also of the meaning. "And so" or thus: That is, in this way, namely, by the sinfulness with its actual manifestations, induced through the one man, 'misery passed through or pervaded to all men.' The original is *διῆλθεν εἰς*. This is rendered by Luther, "penetrated, ist durchgedrungen;" by Tyndale, Cranmer and the Genevan, "went over;" and by Wiclif, "passed forth in to." The assertion is, that this death took effect on mankind thoroughly and universally.—"For (or in) that all have sinned." The various expositions which have been given of this clause and the doctrines supposed to be sanctioned thereby, make it expedient to examine it with particular attention.

"For (or in) that," *ἐφ' ᾧ*. To the same purpose, Tyndale, Cranmer and the Genevan, "in so much." Wiclif has, "in which man," and the marginal reading in our Bibles is, "in whom." This translation has been given by many commentators. The meaning will then be that all men sinned in Adam. This statement will be made, either on the ground of the identity of the human nature possessed by him with that possessed also by all his descendants, or on that of his being their representative, his acts in either case being attributable to them. As it does not comport with the design of these notes to enter into metaphysical disquisitions, I shall merely say with respect to such theories, that they are not in harmony with the practical character of St. Paul's writings, and that a man of plain good sense, not under the influence of some religious or philosophical system, will not easily believe that a voluntary offence of one can justly be charged on any other, not either participating therein or even at the time existing as

ὁ θάνατος · καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάν- all men, for that all have sinned:

a moral or responsible or even personal being. If it should be said that the Scripture speaks of one man acting in or through another, it may be sufficient to reply, that it never charges the guilt of one on another, but on the contrary directly repudiates the idea. See Ezek. xviii., and particularly vs. 19, 20. Heb. vii. 10, which has often been appealed to in support of this view, is inapposite. The case there put is of a descendant paying tithes in his ancestor some hundreds of years before birth, and this involves nothing of a moral nature. It is adduced also by the sacred writer with an introductory formula which greatly qualifies its application. See the note there, p. 93, and Whitby. And further, the Greek preposition is different from that here employed, the one being ἐπί and the other ἐν. The right translation is, ‘for (or in) that, inasmuch as.’ Thus the same phrase is used in 2 Cor. v. 4: “not for that we would be unclothed,” ἐφ’ ᾧ, for which some copies read ἐπειδὴ. Koppe, in his note on Romans, explains it in the same way, quoting from Thomas Magister,* ἐφ’ ᾧ ἀντὶ τοῦ διότι, that is, instead of because; and from Phavorinus, ἐφ’ ᾧ τὴν κλοπὴν εἰργάσω, inasmuch as thou hast committed the theft; and from Theophilus to Autolychus, ἐφ’ ᾧ οὐκ ἴσχυσε θανατῶσαι αὐτούς, because he was unable to put them to death. See also Stuart in loc. and Robinson under ἐπί 11. 3. f).

“Have sinned,” ἡμαρτον. The following are the principal expositions of this expression.

1. ‘Have, as conscious voluntary agents, transgressed God’s known law;’ in other words, have committed actual sins. According to this view it would seem, that the Apostle predicates such sinning of all mankind, infants and idiots not excepted. But with respect to the latter class, this is evidently incredible, as they are not responsible agents; and it is possible that, on account of their comparative paucity, they are not taken into consideration. As to the former, it may be said that we do not know at how early an age moral consciousness commences. This is true, and there is good reason to believe that in different minds it begins at different ages. Still it will hardly be denied that multitudes of infants die, before such a conscious moral character can possibly exist. It is inexpedient to go into detail on such a point, but it may not be amiss to remind hypercritical polemics, that infants sometimes die immediately after birth, not to speak of those who die before; and to affirm conscious transgression of such were more than ridiculous. Even the inquirers, “Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?” cannot be proved to have carried

* This writer, who was a learned monk and grammarian, probably of the 14th century, made a selection of Attic expressions, with illustrations of their meaning from Greek writers. The treatise, which is contained in a small 12mo volume, was published by Nicolas Blancard, at Franeker in 1690. The author quotes passages from Sunesius and Thucydides in support of the meaning above given to the phrase.

their extravagance so far as this ; their question rather assuming a previous state of the soul's existence, according to the Wisdom of Solomon viii. 20. If it should be said that the Apostle does not comprehend either infants or idiots, but speaks only of such descendants of Adam as have arrived at an age of consciousness and have become transgressors of God's moral law ; the reply is, that then his argument is defective. However various may be the opinions respecting certain parts of this discussion, most divines and commentators agree in this one point, that the author's general design is, to compare the evils resulting from the fall with the benefits accruing from the redemption, and to show that the latter are at least equivalent to the former ; and moreover, that in so doing he predicates the evils of all mankind. But, since infants, dying before consciousness can with any probability be affirmed of them, constitute a very large proportion of the race, they cannot be excluded or overlooked in the argument. The result therefore appears evident, namely, that as infants and idiots do not die either physically or spiritually in consequence of their own personal transgressions, this interpretation of the words " have sinned " is inadmissible.

2. Another class of interpreters explain the language thus : ' have been regarded and treated as sinners.' The statement will then be to this effect : ' Inasmuch as all men have been subjected to the consequences of sin.' To what degree this subjection extended would still be a question for examination, although it is plain that physical death is a prominent part, as was before shown on p. 77. The sense thus elicited corresponds with that of ver. 19, " by the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners." Such exposition of language is also sanctioned by analogy. Thus in Genesis xliii. 9, Judah pledges himself to his father Jacob for the safe return of Benjamin in these words, according to our English translation, " let me bear the blame," but in the Hebrew, ' I shall have sinned ;' and so also in xliv. 32. In both these places the Septuagint has translated *literally* ἡμαρτηκὼς ἔσομαι ; but the Vulgate *explains*, ero peccati reus. The meaning is, I am willing to be regarded as a sinner and subjected to the necessary consequences. And in 1 Kings i. 21, what our translation very properly renders, " I and my son Solomon shall be counted offenders," is literally in the Hebrew, ' shall be sinners' and is so expressed in the Septuagint and Vulgate. Stuart's objection to the application of these two places is of no weight. Of the former, he says " the meaning is, I will consent to be regarded as a sinner ' by my father ;' " and of the latter, we " shall be sinners in the view of the reigning prince." It is difficult to see how the signification of the word can be affected by Judah's *consenting* to be so regarded, which certainly Bathsheba and Solomon did not ; or by the party so regarding them being in the one case the father and in the other the reigning prince. Christ is said to be made for us " sin and a curse," that is, (the abstracts being used for the concretes,) a sinner and a cursed

or devoted object, he having *consented* to be regarded and treated as such by *his God and father*. See 2 Cor. v. 21, Gal. iii. 13. It is certain that the Scripture often speaks of a thing as being what it is represented to be and treated as if it were. Thus in Acts x. 15, "what God hath cleansed," that is, regards as clean, 'make not thou common,' *κοῖνοι*; or, as our translation very correctly renders it, "call not thou common." And in 1 John v. 10, "hath made him a liar," can mean nothing else but, 'hath represented and treated him as such.'

3. But there is yet another view which is certainly preferable to the first, and perhaps also to the second of the two just given. "In that all have sinned," may be explained thus: 'inasmuch as all have become sinful.' It may comprehend also the idea of actual sin, predicable of all conscious and responsible human agents as a universal consequence in such; as in the first clause of the verse, the word *sin* is equally comprehensive. Thus the degree and extent of the death or misery which is the necessary result of sinfulness, may be modified according to the degree of meaning affixed to the word. "The subject of the Apostle is the entrance of sin into the world and its spread. The whole dominion of sin is intended."* The extent of that dominion in conscious and unconscious human beings, in infants, for instance, and adult sinners, and the penal consequences resulting therefrom, may vary, and the death alluded to may, in the one case, extend practically no farther than physical and temporal evils, while in the other, it may involve spiritual and everlasting.† The connection of the condition of the race with the act of their progenitor—the idea which beyond any doubt pervades the whole representation—is shown by the fact that in this way, by his act of disobedience, all became sinful. It follows, of course, that as conscious beings they actually sinned. But it does not follow, that the expression is to be limited to such sinning. Even in iii. 23, where it also occurs, no such limitation is necessary, because, as Olshausen says, "where no actual sins have been committed, as in the case of unconscious children, the power of redemption is still needed."

Professor Hodge rejects this interpretation of the clause. A review of his objections will afford an opportunity of sustaining it more fully.

1. "It assigns a very unusual, if not an unexampled, sense to the word."—But on the other hand, first the context favours such a sense. This explanation of the verb *ἥμαρτον* agrees with the meaning above proved to be allowable, and given to the noun *ἀμαρτία*, namely, sinfulness, moral depravity. Thus the two clauses of the latter half of the verse will correspond with the two clauses of the former; "by sin death," misery, ruin,

* Translation of Tholuck's early edition.

† Here I would remind the reader that the Apostle is speaking of death as inflicted on the human race. He says nothing about the inferior animals. The geologist, therefore, may maintain that monsters of various genera and species lived and died, many ages before the creation of man, without involving in any difficulty the statements made either here or elsewhere in the Bible.

being parallel with, "thus death passed through;" and, "by one man sin (or sinfulness) entered," with, "in that all have sinned" or become sinful. Moreover, secondly, analogy justifies this sense. According to it, ἥμαρτον, 'have sinned,' will be employed very much as ἀπέθανον, 'have died,' is in ver. 15, where undoubtedly it signifies 'become subject to death, in a dying condition.' Thus also the language in Gen. ii. 17, "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," to which there is evidently an allusion, expresses rather the mortal condition of the culprit to take place from the very moment of transgression, than the result thereof in the very fact of dying; and this, whatever view may be taken of the nature of the death threatened. In Rom. vii. 9, "I died" signifies, 'I became in,' or was conscious of being in, 'a dead or dying state;' and, the phrase in 2 Cor. v. 14, "all were dead," manifestly affirms the *condition* of all. The Greek word is thus correctly rendered in our translation, although it is the same as that just before used to express the *fact* of Christ's dying for us: "one *died* for all."

2. "It destroys the analogy between Christ and Adam. The point of the comparison is not, as Adam was the source of corruption, so is Christ of holiness; but, as Adam was the cause of our condemnation, so is Christ of our justification."—The comparison is not limited either to the one or the other. The Professor assumes this point of his argument. On a former page he remarks: "All that the Apostle says tends to the illustration of his declaration, as we are condemned on account of what Adam did, we are justified on account of what Christ did." It may all tend to illustrate this, but all is not confined to this particular. The Apostle's representation is the same as that which is briefly expressed in 1 Cor. xv. 22, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." There the life promised to those "that are Christ's," ver. 23, is that condition of glory which is consequent upon the resurrection of the just; who, as they "have borne the image of the first man, the earthy, shall also bear the image of the second man, the heavenly:" vs. 48, 49. It is evident that not only does the antithesis lie between condemnation and justification, but that sin, death and ruin are contrasted with pardon, free gift, abounding grace, and reigning in life eternal. The objection that some of these statements are parenthetical is of very little importance. Others are not; and what may be allowed to be a parenthesis, on account of a difficulty in the construction, which shall presently be noted, is nevertheless essential to a full exhibition of the meaning. As all our woes flow from that state of condemnation into which human nature was brought by the fall of Adam, and all our blessings from that state of justification or acceptance with God which was procured by the atonement of Christ; a statement of the causes would most naturally be accompanied by a representation of the effects. And such is precisely the fact.

What has been said implies also a sufficient answer to the Professor's other objections. His remark, that "the analogy is destroyed, if anything in us be assumed as the ground of the infliction of the penal evils of which the Apostle is here speaking," needs one qualifying circumstance to make it correct. It should be stated thus: '*simply as the original ground*;' or: '*anything in us independently of the sin of Adam.*'

The Apostle's general statement is probably to this effect: 'Thus, through the fall of Adam, death, physical and spiritual misery, took effect on all men, inasmuch as all men have thereby become sinful, and, when conscious agents, sin.' The moral depravity brought into human nature by the sin of Adam will be represented as the cause of its wretchedness. Every assertion in the verse harmonizes with the whole statement.

Theodoret, on verse 12, speaks of 'God's creating Adam under a law in order to exercise his reasoning faculty, and of his transgressing it; by consequence he became obnoxious to death, and in this condition became the father of Cain and Seth and others; and thus all, inasmuch as they are produced of such, have a mortal nature, subject to various wants, by which the passions are often immoderately excited, which want of moderation produces sin.' He then proceeds thus: "Therefore the Apostle says that Adam having sinned, and by sin having become mortal, both (sin and mortality) penetrated into the race. For death passed through to all men in that all have sinned." He then immediately adds: "For each one receives the sentence of death, not on account of his forefather's sin, but on account of his own." If we regard the concluding sentence as affirming death to be the consequence and punishment of the sins of the individual, we make the author inconsistent with what he had just before stated, and also with what soon after follows. On ver. 16, he says: "one having sinned, the whole race received punishment;" and on 18, "he having transgressed, the whole race received the sentence of death."* May he not mean, therefore, in the former passage, that the changed moral condition of man, in other words, the sinfulness introduced into his nature in consequence of the fall, is the cause of his death? This does not proceed as a direct result from the sin of Adam, but directly from his own sinfulness, which however, was thus derived. If so, what the Greek father loses in accuracy of language is more than counterbalanced by consistency of statement.—Chrysostom, in his oratorical manner, comments thus: "How then did death enter and exercise power? By the sin of the one. And what means 'in that all have sinned?' He having fallen, all they also who had not eaten of the tree became from him mortal."†

On the construction of the verse commentators are also very much divided in opinion. The sentence is generally regarded as imperfect. This,

* On Romans. Opera, Tom. iii. pp. 41-43, Edit. Paris. 1642.

† Homily on Romans. Opera, Edit. Bened. Venet. 1741, Tom. ix. p. 519.

13 for until the law, sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when
 14 there is no law: nevertheless, *τας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. Ἀχρι γὰρ νόμου ἀμαρτία ἦν ἐν 13*

however, is questioned by some, who translate *καὶ οὕτως*, *so also*, instead of *and so*. This method of making the sentence complete is adopted by Le Clerc. But it would require a transposition of the two particles as in vs. 15, 18, 19, 21, xi. 31, where we find *οὕτω καί*, as the phrase occurs also in 1 Cor. xii. 12, and many other places. The construction given by Erasmus makes the second clause the apodosis or concluding part of the sentence. In connection with *καί* he supplies a *οὕτως*, which he thinks is to be understood, and this he illustrates by referring to Matt. vi. 10, "as in heaven, *καί*, so also in earth." The result may be expressed thus: 'as by one man sin entered into the world, so also by sin death.' But this does not harmonize with the author's evident design to set Adam and Christ in prominent contrast. Tholuck supposes the apodosis of the sentence to be omitted. He thinks that, toward the end of the 14th verse, the thought of the wider influence of Christ's action than that of Adam presses on his mind, and being unwilling to omit all mention of direct analogy, he introduces it in a compressed form in the words: "who is the figure of him that was to come." But this still leaves the difficulty of the construction unexplained. Most commentators suppose the Apostle, in the warmth of his feeling, to be hurried on by the train of thought which he had commenced to other closely connected thoughts, and not to return to complete the sentence begun in the 12th verse until the middle of the 18th. Thus the latter part of this verse will serve as the conclusion both of the former half, and of the 12th, its form and language being adapted to what immediately precedes it. The intermediate portion, although in some respects parenthetical, is still to be regarded as essential to the full representation of the Apostle's comparison. So long a parenthesis is quite in character with St. Paul's style, and we have a remarkable illustration in Eph. iii., the first verse of which is connected with the 14th, the parenthetical portion being, however, of great importance.

13, 14. The statements made in these two verses, exclusive of the last clause, are the following: Sin existed in the world until the giving of the law; where no law exists sin is not so imputed as to condemn; during the whole period from Adam to Moses death reigned; and its dominion extended over those who had not sinned like Adam. In presenting the first statement, I have given the usual meaning of *ἀχρι*, though Theodoret and some modern annotators explain it so as to require the sense of *during*, and thus extend the period to the establishment of the Gospel. But the phrase "from Adam to Moses" is decisive in favour of the common signification. The Apostle cannot intend these statements to stand as independent propositions. This

κόσμῳ· ἀμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἔλλο- death reigned from Adam to Moses,
 14 γεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου· ἀλλ' ἐβα- even over them that had not sinned

is certain from his character as a writer ; and the use of the particles *for*, *but*, *nevertheless*, sufficiently prove their logical dependence on each other. The idea of Professor Stuart is, that St. Paul intends to meet an objection taken from what he had before said in iv. 15, "where no law is, there is no transgression," namely, "how then were men sinners before the law was given?" and therefore states that men were sinners before the Mosaic law. But it is hardly credible that any person who thought on such topics at all, could imagine that rational beings like men were under no moral law until the time of Moses. Neither is it to be supposed that the Apostle would employ his time in refuting or denying so improbable an objection. The Professor very truly says, that "we are not to suppose that Paul had to do only with candid and intelligent men;" but to this it is sufficient to remark, that neither are we to suppose that he argues with men of no sense or reflection.

A due consideration of the meaning and bearing of the author's propositions will show, that the statements of the 12th verse, 'that death took place universally as a consequence of the sin of Adam,' is what these propositions are intended to prove. The statement that "death reigned from Adam to Moses," is an appeal to what every one knew to be a fact. It is connected with the assertion that "sin was in the world until the law," and introduced by the particle "nevertheless." This suggests to the thoughtful reader an idea which, though not expressed, is most probably implied, namely, that no law then existed making death the penalty of sin. This ellipsis is all that is necessary to be supplied in order to make the argument perfectly clear and conclusive. It will stand thus: 'It is true that sin existed before the Mosaic law. Now it is an undeniable principle that sin is not regarded as sin if there be no law,* yet death lorded it over all mankind from Adam to Moses, whilst no law with the sanction of death existed.†' The Apostle may very well leave the reader to draw the conclusion, which can be none other than this, that therefore mankind did not die for any actual sin of their own; and the previous verse suggests the only alternative, namely, that they died on account of the sin of Adam.

* Though the Apostle sometimes intends to apply this principle with such modification as the subject under consideration would require, yet the principle itself is universally true. There can be no such thing as sin, properly speaking, without law. Its very existence implies law of some kind. Sin in the unconscious infant is that element of his fallen nature which is not in harmony with God's law. An act of a conscious human being may be sinful, which in an irrational animal would not be so. And the reason is found in the Apostle's principle: the one is under moral law, the other not.

† Whitby introduces the word "generally" in his Paraphrase, and regards the Antediluvians and people of Sodom as exceptions to the application of the statement. He does not seem to have considered that the punishment inflicted on these was *violent death*, whereas St. Paul uses the word to denote *mortality*, to which they were subject, in common with every descendant of Adam, in the ordinary course of nature.

after the similitude of Adam's trans- σίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ 'Αδὰμ
μέχρι Μωϋσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς

The language of Chrysostom is entirely coincident with this view of St. Paul's reasoning. "Sin cannot subsist where there is no law. If therefore, says he, this sin from the transgression of the law brought forth death, how did all they that were before the law die? For if death had its root from sin, and there being no law sin is not reckoned, how did death exercise force? Whence it is evident that it was not this sin which is of the transgression of the law, but that which is of the disobedience of Adam which destroyed all things. And what is the proof? For death reigned, says he, from Adam," &c.*

I freely admit that there is a difficulty which perhaps cannot be satisfactorily removed, namely, "the *limitation* of the period," to use the language of the Professor above cited, "from Adam to Moses. Why should the Apostle stop within these narrow limits? Why confine his assertion" thus? I would rather say, the *designation* of this period; for that he meant thus to *limit* the operation of the death spoken of is an unfounded assumption. It may not be easy to give a reason for this designation. And yet it is very conceivable, that, writing to a church consisting chiefly of Jewish converts, he might choose to note the introduction of the law by Moses in contrast to the time of Adam's fall, as representing a period during which there was no law threatening mortality as the effect of transgressing it, although it would have served his general purpose equally well to have extended the period even to his own day. He might have said, from the time of Adam to the present no such law has existed. The promulgation of the Mosaic law was a great epoch, especially with the Hebrews, and therefore might very fitly stand in contrast with the original transgression of God's law by Adam. If the Zechariah of Matt. xxiii. 35, be the prophet mentioned in 2 Chron. xxiv. 20-22, as is maintained by the best commentators, the question may be asked, why does not our Lord extend the period designated by him to his own day, from the time of the first murder to that of the last? The striking character of the death of Zechariah, and the impression it had made on the Jewish mind,† supply the answer. So also does the application of the same principle in the present instance. Such a difficulty is by no means sufficiently weighty to set aside an exposition in accordance with the context and with analogy of Scripture.

"Even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's

* Ubi sup. p. 520.

† In Lightfoot's Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations, the reader may find on the verse in Matthew a Jewish legend quoted from the Talmud, the extravagant superstition of which is proof enough of the remark.

μη ἀμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοι-
 ῳματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ,
 ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος.
 15 Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα,
 οὕτω καὶ τὸ χάρισμα· εἰ γὰρ

gression, who is the figure of him
 that was to come. But not as the
 offence, so also is the free gift: for

transgression.” It is perhaps impossible to say what degree of likeness is intended. If the author means in this clause of the verse to express some additional idea to that in the former, then he may be supposed to comprehend infants and idiots, who are not conscious transgressors against any known divine law. Both clauses, however, may relate to the same whole body of Adam’s descendants, the latter merely stating that this body had not sinned in the same way as their first father had. This is true in more points than one. His condition was that of innocence; theirs, of moral depravity. He broke a positive divine law, the transgression of which involved the penalty of death; they were never subjected to such a law. Other points of difference might be stated, but these are sufficient to explain the author’s language. Professor Hodge objects to this view, “that it destroys the distinction between the two classes of persons here alluded to.” Certainly it does; but that there are two classes between whom a distinction must be made, is the very point to be proved. “It makes Paul, in effect, reason thus, ‘death reigned over those who had not violated any positive law, even over those who had not violated any positive law.’” This is not so. The exposition makes the first clause a merely general statement, that death conquered all that body of Adam’s descendants who lived before Moses, and the second a declaration that the nature of their sin differed from his. “It is obvious that the first clause describes a general class, and the second, distinguished by the word *even*, only a portion of that class.”—But this inference is founded on the English translation “even,” and will be without support if the copulative be rendered *and*. The first clause will affirm that death held general sway; the second will state a distinction between the sin of the parent and that of his children.

“The figure (literally, type) of him that was to come.” The original participle τοῦ μέλλοντος, although used in the feminine to designate Messiah’s kingdom, or the Gospel dispensation as regarded in contradistinction to the Jewish, is equally applicable to Messiah himself, who is here intended. The word usually employed is ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Probably the Apostle preferred the other from having in mind the contrast between the blessings of Messiah’s kingdom as a whole, with their forfeiture in the natural condition of fallen man.—The word type means an impression, image or representation of something. It generally supposes points of similarity in the two, as is illustrated in the case of the priesthoods of Melchisedek and Christ. Sometimes, however, it is used to express

if through the offence of one many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, <i>which</i> is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath	τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολ- λοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἢ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς
--	---

contrast, as in the present instance, and most probably in that which occurs in 1 Pet. iii. 21, where baptism seems to be contrasted with the flood. Here Adam is introduced as the type of Christ, as he is also in 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. In vs. 45, 47, he is spoken of as “the first man:” and the Messiah as “the last” and “the second,” meaning, in his character as contrasted with Adam, both standing in a relation to the human race somewhat similar.

15. Having stated the typical analogy of the two, the author now proceeds to note certain points of dissimilarity. These either show that the restoration through Christ completely counterbalances the evils induced by means of Adam’s transgression, or that it does in reality go beyond them, making the advantage superior to the loss. ‘But the gracious benefit, τὸ χάρισμα, is not (in all respects) as the fall: for, if by the fall of the one the many died; much rather hath the grace of God, and the gift through the grace which is of the one man Jesus Christ, abounded to the many.’ The language is pleonastic, expressive of the greatness and the freeness of the gratuity. The article τῇ which qualifies χάριτι, shows that the translation just given is the true one. Here we have the fall or offence or transgression, contrasted with the divine favour; the misery and ruin brought on the mass by this fall of Adam, with the gracious gift of the Gospel procured through Christ for the same mass; and we have the Apostle’s statement, that it is much rather to be expected that this great benefit should abound to Adam’s posterity, than that the ruinous effects of the fall should extend to them. The representation is an appeal to our right estimate of the divine character, and especially its benevolence. Ἐπερίσσευσεν implies that the benefit spoken of is completely extended.

It must be evident to any unbiassed reader, that *the many*, οἱ πολλοί, in both connections in this verse means the whole mass of mankind. In neither clause does it admit a limited signification. And this is true also of the same word in ver. 19, which is certainly equivalent to the phrase “all men” which immediately precedes it. This view of the universality of the results both of Adam’s fall and of Christ’s atonement, is the only one which corresponds with the scope of the section and the connection in which it stands with the writer’s argument. It illustrates his main points, namely, that justification cannot be attained on the ground of perfect obedience, and that the blessings of the Gospel are not at all exclusive.

16 ἐπερίσσευσε. Καὶ οὐχ ὥς δι' ἀβούδς ἀμαρτήσαντος τὸ δῶρημα· it abounded unto many. And not as 16
τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἀβούδς εἰς it was by one that sinned, so is the
κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ gift: for the judgment was by one
πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δι- to condemnation; but the free gift
is of many offences unto justifica-

16. "By one that sinned," ἀμαρτήσαντος. Some important manuscripts, the Syriac, Vulgate, and other versions, and several of the fathers, read, ἀμαρτήματος. But this reading arose most probably from an attempt to make a more expressive contrast between ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων towards the close of the verse and the preceding ἐξ ἀβούδς with which παραπτώματος must be understood, by introducing a similar word in the first clause. To this may have been added a desire to adapt the language more closely to that employed in vs. 15, 17, where παράπτωμα repeatedly occurs. The received reading is no doubt genuine. The phraseology is somewhat varied from that of the previous verse. Δῶρημα, is equivalent to δωρεά or rather to χάρισμα which precedes it. The κρίμα or sentence against Adam sprang from his one offence and announced condemnation; the gracious benefaction procured by Christ proclaims liberation from the consequence of many offences, so as to secure forgiveness, divine acceptance, and the blessings resulting.

The first clause of this verse is evidently elliptical. It may be completed by understanding sentence or condemnation or consequence or some such expression, which may stand in contradistinction to "gift," thus implying the effect of the sin of the one man. The contrast is more particularly drawn out immediately afterwards, both in the remainder of this verse and in the next. Ἐξ ἀβούδς is not equivalent to δι' ἀβούδς, for this relates to Adam and that to his one transgression, which is contrasted with the many transgressions of his posterity. A few commentators have rendered ἐξ ἀβούδς (παραπτώματος,) by the offence of one, and the corresponding phrase ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων, by the offences of many. But this view is not only entirely unnecessary, but quite improbable; and moreover, according to the author's usage ἀβούδς ought to have the article. Comp. ver. 15, 'by the fall of *the* one—the grace of *the* one;' also ver. 17, 'by the fall of *the* one death reigned through *the* one—shall reign in life through *the* one;' also in ver. 19, 'disobedience of *the* one man—obedience of *the* one.' The articles are certainly intended to be emphatic, and ought not to be unnoticed in the translation.

17. It is important to note that here the Apostle's antithesis, while it contains the same general idea as before stated, is also somewhat exegetical. In contrasting the benefit of the redemption with the evil of the fall, he speaks of those who *receive* the precious boon; implying thereby the co-operation of the party benefitted with the gracious giver. The benefit is

<p>17 tion. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one ; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one,</p>	<p>καίωμα. Εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς 17 παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε διὰ τοῦ ἐνός, πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης</p>
--	---

described in language expressive of abundance, and is like the phrase "riches of grace, riches of glory," which also imply 'fulness and excellence.' The reigning in life predicated of the recipients of this abundance of grace, is evidently in contrast with the reign of death attributable to the fall, and describe the true Christian's everlasting happiness.

It is thought by many distinguished commentators that in this contrast between Adam and Christ, the Apostle intends to show that the amount of benefit received is vastly greater than that of evil entailed. This has been supposed to be implied in the phrase "the abundance of grace," τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος. Locke speaks of a "surplusage of the gift" as "a justification to life from a multitude of sins, whereas the loss came only for one sin." This he calls "the excess of the favour, the inequality of the gift itself, which exceeds as many exceeds one." Stuart is decidedly of this opinion. "The superabounding of Gospel grace which is insisted on so emphatically in vs. 15-17 consists in the fact, that the death of Christ procures pardon for the numerous offences which we commit, while the effects of Adam's sin have respect only to one offence. The remedy is far more powerful and efficacious than the corruption and misery." He repeats this view several times afterwards. Professor Hodge, in commenting on the 15th verse, allows that "the design is not to show that the blessings procured by Christ are greater than the evils caused by Adam ;" and this he says "the attentive reader will perceive constantly increasing evidence" of. He remarks very truly, that "the force of the passage lies in the words *much more*." But nevertheless on ver 16, he maintains the same view of *surplusage or superiority*. "The point of this verse is, that the sentence of condemnation which passed on all men for the sake of Adam, was for *one* offence, whereas we are justified by Christ from *many* offences. Christ does much more than remove the fault and evils consequent on the sin of Adam." The same substantially is stated afterwards more than once.

On reading the Apostle's contrast, the first impression is, that he does intend to teach some such superiority of benefit through Christ over evil through Adam. Doubtless most readers feel a desire to make out such a superiority ; and furthermore, various considerations, drawn from the inspired author's phraseology and from the paternal and benevolent character of God, make it highly probable that the grace of the Gospel does really afford more than a mere counterbalance to the evils of the fall. The 20th verse also does expressly state that "where sin doth abound grace hath

<p>λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύ- σουσι διὰ τοῦ ἐνδὸς Ἰησοῦ Χρισ- 18 τοῦ. Ἄρα οὖν ὥς δι' ἐνδὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντα ἀν- θρώπους εἰς κατὰκριμα, οὕτω</p>	<p>Jesus Christ. Therefore, as by the 18 offence of one, <i>judgment came</i> upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, <i>the free</i> <i>gift came</i> upon all men unto justi-</p>
--	--

much more abounded," *ὑπερεπερίσσευσε*. Still, our very imperfect knowledge of what would have been the condition of Adam and of his posterity, (if we may speak of them in such circumstances,) had he not fallen, makes it exceedingly difficult if not impossible for us to obtain anything more than very general ideas on such a topic. Where reason can teach nothing and divine revelation withholds light, we must be content to be ignorant. And not to affect a knowledge which we cannot have is our highest wisdom. I cannot see the force of some of the statements just quoted. If the condemnation in some degree of the whole race resulted from the offence of Adam, who is allowed to have "introduced sin and misery into the world, and in consequence of this all are in a state in which they are greatly exposed to the second death;" if such be the results of this "*one offence*," it became necessary in order to counterbalance them that Christ should "procure pardon for the *numerous* offences which we commit." A liberation from the consequences of these comprehends nothing beyond what our condition required in order to remove the existing evil. It would seem, therefore, that a superiority of favour beyond what was necessary for this purpose, is not clearly deduced from the expressions which have been supposed to justify such a conclusion; the language, as I have already said, being rather an appeal to our right appreciation of God's benevolence, as a sufficient ground for expecting at the very least a prompt and willing remedy.

18, 19. "By the offence of one—by the righteousness of one:" This translation is sanctioned by several distinguished commentators, among whom is Tholuck. Our marginal reading is, 'by one offence—by one righteousness.' This corresponds best with the Greek, *δι' ἐνδὸς παραπτώματος—δι' ἐνδὸς δικαιώματος*; and it is probably the true version. For, as I have already remarked, where the other meaning is clearly intended, the Apostle always employs the article. The one offence is the sin of Adam, and the one righteousness the obedience of Christ. This latter comprehends whatever was necessary to constitute his atonement and satisfaction to divine justice, which the Scripture generally represents as his sufferings and death, these being most especially prominent and essential. Thus, as the contrast was before stated to be between the condemnation resulting from Adam's one offence and the deliverance procured by Christ from our many offences; so here it will be between his one sin and Christ's successive acts and whole habit of obedience both active and passive. Any separation between these two kinds of obedience so as to give an importance

19 fication of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς. "Ὡς περ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται

and superiority to the one over the other, is without scriptural warrant. In the first clause of the text we must supply from the 16th verse the word "sentence," and in the second "free-gift." The whole passage as an inference from what had been before said and in accordance therewith, is introduced by "therefore," ἄρα οὖν. In this respect it is similar to ver. 12, with which it is probably connected. See the note there, p. 84.—The following verse is to the same general effect. The *disobedience* of the one man corresponds with *the one offence* just stated; and the *obedience* of the one with the *one righteousness*. It is unnecessary to say that, in both clauses, the one and the many stand in contradistinction to each other; the many being equivalent to the whole mass of mankind, as the same adjective is used also in ver. 15.—The word rendered "were made," κατεστάθησαν, means "to set down, settle, establish, bring into a certain state, to make so and so, to cause to be, to render, to make." See the Lexicon of Liddell and Scott, also Robinson's. Olshausen's meaning, as given in the translation, is, "to be set forth as somewhat, and by the setting forth to be pronounced to be somewhat." Whether in this verse it is to be understood in the sense of regarding as sinners, or actually becoming sinners, is disputed. That it may be taken in the former sense, is evident from the general tenour of the context, and from the way in which such words are often employed. The language in 1 John v. 10, "he that believeth not God hath *made* him a liar," may be regarded as parallel. Although the Greek verb is ποιέω, it will not be questioned that it is at least as strong to express a real making of the character described as that here used. And yet no one ever thinks of affixing to it such a signification. The other sense, however, of actually becoming sinners, is certainly according to common usage. It is probable that the Apostle means to convey the idea with which he commenced his comparison in the 12th verse. As Adam's disobedience was the occasion of the sinfulness and positive transgressions of his race, their condemnation in a greater or less degree being consequently included, so also shall Christ's obedience become the procuring cause of the acquittal, acceptance and restoration of the same race, provided they embrace the Gospel. The limitation annexed to the latter statement, is in accordance with the usage of Scripture, in making positive statements and absolute promises when the necessary condition is presumed.

<p>20 οἱ πολλοί. Νόμος δὲ παρεια- ἦλθεν, ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ πα- ράπτωμα· οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ 21 χάρις, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ</p>	<p>Moreover, the law entered, that the 20 offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned 21</p>
--	--

In illustration of this principle, it may be sufficient to refer to two passages. In Num. xxv. 12, 13, an absolute promise of "an everlasting priesthood" is made to Phineas and his posterity; and yet, in the course of a few generations, this office passed into another family. Subsequently, indeed, it reverted to the descendants of Phineas in the person of Zadok, in whose line it continued. Thus the succession was broken, and this shows that the original promise, though expressed absolutely, implied some condition which had been violated. See the Commentators on the text in Numbers. Again, in 1 Cor. iii. 15, it is said of the Christian minister whose efforts will not stand the test of the great searching examination, "he shall be saved," adding a figurative expression implying great difficulty. But no one can suppose that the salvation of such a one is affirmed absolutely. Undoubtedly, the condition of sincerity, at least, is implied. The limitation before spoken of is also in accordance with the 14th and 17th verses, where the reign of death over the whole race is contrasted with the glorious reign in life of those who *receive* the rich abundance of the divine and gracious gift.

20, 21. "The law:" The Greek is without the article, and so probably should the translation be. It is frequently explained simply of the law as promulgated by Moses. But although the moral law thus communicated may have been prominent in the author's mind, (compare "from Adam to Moses" in ver. 14;) yet I can see no reason why he may not comprehend the law as a moral rule under which man, as a conscious and responsible being, was originally placed. See 1 Tim. i. 8-10, where, after stating the excellence of moral law in general, he proceeds to speak of it evidently as promulgated to the Hebrews.

"Entered," *παρεισῆλθεν*. Our translation disregards the preposition *παρά*, and renders the compound verb, as it does the simple in ver. 12, "sin entered," to which the Apostle most probably alludes. Tyndale and Cranmer translate, "in the meane tyme entred in." The word may be intended to convey this idea, that law took effect on the sinner unexpectedly, or that he came under it in some measure unawares. Compare the use of the preposition in composition in Gal. ii. 4, 2 Pet. ii. 1, and Jude 4. It is more probable, however, that the verb expresses the idea of entering beside or along with. Then the meaning will be, that along with the entrance of sin law, that is, a fuller consciousness and appreciation of it, took effect on human nature.

unto death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.	ἀμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιο- σύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
---	--

“That the offence might abound:” The author explains his meaning more fully in vii. 5, 7–13, where he represents moral law both as showing the sinner his guilt and condemnation, and becoming the occasion of exciting his weak and sinful nature to transgression. Were the former result the whole of the Apostle’s idea, *ἵνα* might be *telic*, that is, it might express the *end* for which the law was given, and the translation be, *in order that*; as it was certainly one part of the design of the law to bring the offender to a proper sense of his sins. But, as it cannot be thus limited, and as the law does actually become the occasion of sins abounding or increasing, it is better to translate, ‘so that sin abounded.’ Thus what is said of the law both here and in the 7th chapter, may be illustrated by Matt. x. 34, 35, where the evils that sprang from hostility to the Gospel are represented as if they were the direct result of the Saviour’s advent.

The remainder of these verses expresses the triumph of grace over sin, in language which has already been explained. The translation of *δικαιοσύνης*, which is most in harmony with the whole section and also with what precedes it, is *justification*. The expression *eternal life*, the full meaning of which is made clear by the epithet, is placed in contrast with the more general and less accurately defined one *death*.

SECTION VIII.

CHAP. VI.

THE DOCTRINES OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH AND SALVATION BY DIVINE FAVOUR, AFFORD NO ENCOURAGEMENT TO SIN, BUT RATHER PRESENT THE STRONGEST MOTIVES TO HOLINESS.

VI. τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμενοῦμεν What shall we say then? Shall VI.
τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεο- we continue in sin, that grace may

CHAP. vi. The Apostle now proceeds to guard the doctrine advanced from becoming the ground or occasion of sinful indulgence. The grace of God through Christ, which the previous discussion has shown to abound towards the human race, has in all ages been perverted by the corrupt heart to antinomian recklessness of living. The question in ver. 1 may be the language of a depraved objector, or it may be the author's manner of stating the mischievous inference drawn from the previous truth. What follows contains two most important considerations in direct opposition to the practical fallacy of such a conclusion. The first develops the fundamental principle, that in the truly baptized person such a continuance in sin is simply impossible, because by real Christian baptism he has become mystically united to Christ, therefore dead and buried with him to sin, with a view to a moral resurrection, the precursor of a physical and spiritual and glorious one at the last day. The other consideration, which is brought forward in connection with this and made the ground of exhortation, is, that the profession of Christianity which we publicly make in baptism, binds us to avoid sin and to cultivate holiness. Hence it follows that, as *professing* Christians, we cannot consistently abuse the grace of the Gospel by practising sin, nor, as *real* Christians mystically united with Christ and receiving from him through this union a principle of divine and holy life, is such practice possible. These two points will be more fully illustrated in what follows.

Ver. 1. The received reading is ἐπιμενοῦμεν, for which many, both ancient and valuable authorities, have ἐπιμένωμεν. The reader who is acquainted with the Greek forms will perceive that either reading affords a clear meaning, and accords with the context: 'shall' or 'may we continue?'

2. "Dead to sin:" Such figurative language is very common in the New Testament. Thus in the next chapter, the Jews are said to be "dead to the law," ver. 4; and in Eph. ii. 1, men in their natural state are called "dead in trespasses and sins." It is unnecessary to multiply references.

2 abound? God forbid. How shall *νάση; Μὴ γένοιτο · οἵτινες ἀπε-* 2
 we, that are dead to sin, live any *θάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι*
 3 longer therein? Know ye not, *ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ; Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε,* 3

As it is true of figurative language in general, so is it particularly true of this, that the expositor should be cautious not to carry the comparison extravagantly far; and any degree is extravagant, which becomes forced and unnatural. There are points of resemblance, however, which must recommend themselves to every reflecting mind.

1) The state of death implies a state of insensibility, and it is both the duty and the privilege of Christians to become in a measure insensible to and unaffected by the delusive charms of sin, so that the man who was once all alive to its influence becomes indifferent to its most pressing solicitations.—2) And as the Christian is dead to sin, so also is sin in his view as a dead object. The Apostle suggests this thought in ver. 6, where he represents the “old man” as “crucified with” Christ, “that the body of sin might be destroyed.” Compare Gal. vi. 14: “the world is crucified unto me.” As the dead object cannot excite the pleasurable emotions and desires to which when living it gave birth, so neither can sin in the mind of the Christian. As, on the contrary, the dead object excites the opposite sentiments or feelings, those namely of aversion and disgust; so does sin in the soul of the true Christian. Other points of similarity might doubtless be traced, but these will sufficiently illustrate the Apostle’s figure. The Christian is dead to sin, and sin is dead to him. Living any longer in the practice of it is therefore impossible, because he is influenced by the principle of a different, yea, an opposite life.

3. “So many of us” (rather: ‘we as many,’) “as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?” What is it to be baptized into Christ? or what does true Christian baptism mean? A proper answer to this question may throw light not only on the Apostle’s statements here, but also on other parts of the sacred word.

When John distinguished his own baptism from that of the Messiah, whom he introduced by the announcement that he should “baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire,” (Matt. iii. 11;) there can be no doubt that the miraculous effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, when the ability to speak in unknown languages was conveyed under the significant emblem of apparent fiery tongues, was intended: See Acts i. 5, xi. 16. But it does not therefore follow that the Baptist’s language had no further reference. It exhibits undoubtedly, in striking contrast, the difference between his own preliminary and imperfect baptism, and that of the divine one who was “above all,” and who “must increase” until he should receive again “that glory which he had with the Father before the world was.” Christ’s baptism and Christ’s spirituality and divine nature are in perfect

ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χρισ- that so many of us as were bap-
 τὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον tized into Jesus Christ were baptized
 4 αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν; Συνετά- into his death? Therefore we are 4

harmony. There is scarcely any conceivable moral and spiritual elevation, which may not scripturally and reasonably be represented as the legitimate result of Christian baptism rightfully and fully understood. But it is all-important to have a clear conception of what such Christian baptism is. To suppose that it consists in the immersion of the baptized party or in his affusion or aspersion with water in the name of the holy Trinity, and by a minister of Christ acknowledged to be properly authorised, would be to form a very imperfect conception of its true nature and significancy.—Real Christian baptism is both internal and outward; and it is most generally thus represented in the New Testament. Inasmuch as the great mass of baptized persons in the age of Christ and his Apostles were adults, baptism is usually spoken of in reference to such; although it is demonstrable that infants also were partakers of that holy sacrament. The language of St. Peter is most instructive in reference to the true nature and meaning of this Christian institution. He tells us that baptism is “not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God:” 1 Pet. iii. 21. If any thing is clear in language, this definition affirms Christian baptism to be something more than an external washing of the outer man, and makes it comprehend also an inward religious character, avowed in conscientious profession thereof before God. And thus St. Paul also describes it in Col. ii. 11, as the “putting off the body of the sins of the flesh,” and in Gal. iii. 27, as ‘the putting on of Christ,’ which implies, according to the figure of clothing as used in the Bible, not a mere external profession, but a real possession of the inward character avowed. It may be well in passing to confirm this remark. I beg the reader, therefore, to attend to the following passages.

“*Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ,*” Rom. xiii. 14: that is, become thoroughly like him in holiness. A real assimilation in moral character is most certainly the thing inculcated. “*Have put on Christ,*” Gal. iii. 27: in other words, have become like him. “*Shall be clothed with shame,*” Job viii. 22: the meaning is evident, shall be openly and really disgraced. And so in Ps. xxxv. 26: “*Let them be clothed with shame and dishonour.*” Compare also cix. 17–19. In Isa. lix. 17, “*he was clad with zeal as a cloak,*” expresses the real possession of what is thus figuratively represented. And so also lxi. 10, “*he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation,*” &c. Compare Judg. vi. 34, “the Spirit of the Lord came upon (Heb. and Sept. *clothed*) Gideon.”

With all this accords the statement in our catechism, that baptism comprehends “water, the outward and visible sign,” and also “an inward

buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we

φημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὡς περ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς, οὕτω

and spiritual grace," namely, "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness." It follows, therefore, that where either of these is wanting baptism is imperfect; and surely it cannot be imagined that the inward part of the sacrament is less important than the outward.

Now, in the chapter under consideration, as is also generally the case in the New Testament, the Apostle represents the baptized Christian as having fully received this sacred and divine institution, and consequently experienced the inward reforming character which it symbolizes. He speaks of baptism and of the baptized as they really are according to the Christian scheme, not in accommodation to any imperfect view and reception of the sacrament. Therefore it is that he employs language so greatly significant. And the fulness of his thought is not applicable to, neither can it be rightly appreciated by, any one who has not been inwardly baptized with the Holy Ghost, as well as outwardly with the symbolical element. To be baptized into Christ does not simply mean into the acknowledgment of Jesus as the true Messiah, but rather it denotes a spiritual connection with him, whence results a participation of the blessings of his grace, those flowing from his death and resurrection. The truly baptized Christian has been incorporated into Christ, so as to have become really in spirit, though not personally, one with him; as Christ died literally and was buried, so does the scripturally baptized Christian die and become buried spiritually. Thus the Apostle carries out the figure with which he begins, implying the thoroughness of the true Christian's spiritual death and burial to sin. He gives also the counterpart of this representation in the baptized Christian's privilege to be raised to a new and holy life, in imitation of Christ's resurrection. This is said to have been accomplished "by the glory of the Father," meaning his divine power. Thus the word "glory" is used in John xi. 40, "thou shouldst see the glory of God," and in Exod. xvi. 7, "ye shall see the glory of the Lord." According to this view the reader will perceive, that it is not merely what the Christian professes in baptism which the Apostle here speaks of, but rather what by full baptism he receives.

It has been inferred from the 4th verse, that St. Paul alludes to the ancient mode of baptizing by immersion. But this is not supported by the phrase, which merely carries out the figure, denoting the completeness of the spiritual death before mentioned. And thus in Galatians vi. 14, he speaks of himself as not only dead, but "crucified to the world," the excruciating kind of death amplifying the figure and increasing the impression.

καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς πε- 5 ριπατήσωμεν. Εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς	also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted to- 5 gether in the likeness of his death, we shall be also <i>in the likeness</i> of
--	---

5. "Planted (or grown) together:" This implies most intimate connection, and with Christ, as the αὐτῷ in the previous verse shows. The figure is taken from the vegetable kingdom; and the points on which the resemblance turns are Christ's death and resurrection. Our death to sin corresponds with the former, and our present moral and future glorious resurrection with the latter. The ellipsis in the last clause is correctly supplied in our English translation. Ἀλλὰ καὶ is best rendered 'truly also, yea even.' Comp. Luke xii. 7, xvi. 21. The latter part of the verse expresses the twofold resurrection just stated; the future glorious one being the natural result, according to the principles of the Gospel, of the present moral one.

6, 7. "Our old man:" The sinful element or condition of fallen nature is here personified. It is figuratively represented as crucified along with Christ, the allusion being evidently to the lingering, painful and ignominious nature of Christ's death, and also to the similarity in these respects attendant on the mortification and destruction of this element. "The new man" mentioned in Eph. iv. 24 is the divine principle implanted by the Holy Spirit, which is in accordance with that divine image in which man was originally created. This is to grow and to become the predominating principle of the whole character, while the other is gradually to be subjected and eventually destroyed, as the next clause shows.—"The body of sin:" This is often explained of the body literally understood, and represented as the seat of sinful affections and appetites. Similar language occurs in vii. 24, viii. 13, and Col. ii. 11. But it is a fatal objection to this view, that "the body of sin" is spoken of as something to be destroyed, whereas, the literal body is to be raised and glorified. This objection cannot be removed by limiting the destruction simply to the body's sinful proneness, for the Apostle affirms it of the body itself. The phraseology does not necessarily imply that the body is the original seat of sin, and that by connection with it the soul becomes morally contaminated; although, in our present condition, it doubtless has an influence on the moral character of our spiritual nature. This same body is hereafter to become glorified; but it is not the old man or body of sin that is to be vivified. The word *body*, equivalent to עָצָם or גִּוּף may, by a Hebrew usage, stand for the *substance* or *reality* of sin, which is figuratively represented as incarnated.—"Is freed from sin:" Literally, justified from it. Compare the similar phrase in Acts xiii. 39. It means cleared from its imputation, and liberated from its controlling power. See ver. 18.

- 6 *his* resurrection: knowing this, that *his* resurrection: knowing this, that 6
 our old man is crucified with *him*, νώσκοντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν
 that the body of sin might be de- ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα
 stroyed, that henceforth we should καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρ-
 7 not serve sin. For he that is dead τίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς
 8 is freed from sin. Now if we be τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. Ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν 7
 dead with Christ, we believe that δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.
 9 we shall also live with him: know- Εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, 8
 ing that Christ, being raised from πιστεύομεν, ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν
 the dead, dieth no more; death hath αὐτῷ, εἰδότες, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐγερ- 9
 10 no more dominion over him. For θεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀπο-
 in that he died, he died unto sin θνήσκει· θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι
 once; but in that he liveth, he κυριεύει. Ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ 10

8, 9. The present moral death to sin, which implies also a life to righteousness, brings along with it as its Christian consequence, future everlasting and glorious life with Christ in heaven. The living with Christ which is here spoken of cannot be limited to any moral or spiritual condition in this life, because it is represented as an object of faith: “we *believe* that we shall also live with him.” Whatever of this life the Christian obtains here is the mere germ and commencement of what he expects to enjoy hereafter. The 9th verse gives the reason for such a belief. Christ, having risen from the dead, is forever immortal. The Apostle’s language is that of triumph: ‘death no more lords it over him.’ “He ever liveth to make intercession” for those who belong to him, and therefore, according to his promise, “because he liveth they shall live also.” Compare Heb. vii. 25, and John xiv. 19; and see the same sentiment in Rom. v. 10.

10. Ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε· ὁ δὲ ζῇ. This might be translated thus: ‘For what he died—but what he liveth;’ that is, the death that he died, the life that he lives: See Tholuck. This would be equivalent to the common translation, which is obtained by understanding *κατά* before *ὁ*, which is a very frequent ellipsis. Literally it would be, ‘according to what.’ The rendering of Macknight, “he who died—he who liveth,” is inadmissible. The Greek usage would require either *ὅς* with the verb, or *ὁ* with the participle.—“He died unto sin:” Rather, ‘with reference to, for.’ The thought is more fully expressed elsewhere. He died both to expiate sin by making a suitable atonement, and to destroy its power in us.—“Once:” The one offering of Christ is forever satisfactory, and cannot be repeated. Compare Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 10, 12, 14. See also ix. 26, and the note there.—“He liveth unto God:” That is, in order to advance the divine honour; since the humiliation and subsequent exaltation of “the son of man” not only “glorifies” himself, but also “glorifies God with him.” John xiii. 31.

ἀμαρτία ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ · ὁ δὲ
 11 ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ. Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς
 λογίσεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν
 τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ
 12 ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Μὴ οὖν βασι-
 λεύετω ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ
 ὑμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν
 13 ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ πα-
 ριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὄπλα
 ἀδικίας τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ · ἀλλὰ παρα-
 στήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡς ἐκ
 νεκρῶν ζῶντας, καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν
 14 ὄπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ. 'A- liveth unto God. Likewise reckon 11
 ye also yourselves to be dead indeed
 unto sin, but alive unto God through
 Jesus Christ our Lord. Let not sin 12
 therefore reign in your mortal
 body, that ye should obey it in the
 lusts thereof. Neither yield ye 13
 your members as instruments of
 unrighteousness unto sin ; but yield
 yourselves unto God, as those that
 are alive from the dead, and your
 members as instruments of right-
 eousness unto God. For sin shall 14

11-13. Thus far the author has described chiefly the effect of a true union with Christ in producing a principle of spiritual life incompatible with a state of sinfulness. But, inasmuch as its actual developments and operation in the Christian's holiness is, in the present state of being, always imperfect and generally so to a very great degree, he now proceeds, in view of the Christian profession made in baptism, to exhort to a consistent character and conduct.

"So also you," &c. : This is founded on our union with Christ before spoken of. The exhortation does not lose sight of the truth that here sin will exercise some influence, since "there is no man that sinneth not," and therefore the Apostle says, "let not sin *reign* in your mortal body," &c. The epithet here employed describes the body in its present frail and dying condition, in which it is made the organ of sin, in contradistinction to the same body immortal and become the instrument of sanctity and happiness. Such language gives no ground for the opinion, already adverted to, of the body being the seat of sinful passions.—The concluding clause of the 12th verse is variously read in ancient authorities. The reading in the received text after ὑπακούειν is as follows : αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ. Some omit the whole clause, and their testimony is followed by Griesbach and other editors. Hahn and some others retain the last three words and omit the preceding two ; and others omit the last four, and conclude the verse with αὐτῇ. The general sense will be the same, as the obedience to sin is shown in yielding to corporeal desires.

14. "The law," as such, conveys no power wherewith to resist sin. But "grace" or the Gospel does in the influence of the Holy Spirit. This difference of the two states affords a sufficient reason for the assertion, that sin shall not lord it over the Christian.

15. This verse, which is in striking analogy with the first, states the utter incongruity, both with Christian character and profession, of practising

not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under 15 grace. What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid. 16 Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey? whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? 17 But God be thanked, that ye were	μάρτια γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χάριν. Τί οὖν; ἁμαρτήσομεν, ὅτι 15 οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ νόμον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χάριν; μὴ γένοιτο. Οὐκ οἶδατε, 16 ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δοῦ- λους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἥτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον, ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιο- σύνην; Χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ, ὅτι 17 ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὑπη-
--	--

sin. The Apostle rejects with abhorrence the thought of thus abusing the grace of the Gospel. In the next he illustrates what he had said, by referring to the human relation of master and servant. The last clause requires a few illustrative remarks. The words “to death,” *εἰς θάνατον*, are omitted in several weighty authorities, although the evidence preponderates in their favour. If they were not an original part of the text, it would be difficult to assign a good reason for their insertion, while the apparent want of antithesis to “righteousness” may have induced some transcribers to reject them. It is not probable that *δικαιοσύνη* here means justification; for then the Apostle’s statements would conflict with the general scope of his argument throughout the Epistle. Professor Stuart indeed does contend for this meaning. But he has not presented any considerations of weight to sustain it; and towards the end of his note he substitutes “eternal life” for “justification.” His objection to explaining righteousness by religion, that this is identical with obedience, may be answered by the remark, that successive acts of obedience lead to the formation of a righteous or religious character. This is probably what the Apostle means, as in ver. 22, the “fruit” of serving God is stated to be “holiness;” to which it might be objected with equal plausibility, that this service is itself holiness. But the signification most probably is, that such holy service results in the advantage of possessing a holy habit.—Neither ought the translation to be ‘happiness,’ for this is not a legitimate meaning of *δικαιοσύνη*, although it is a necessary result of what it does mean, namely, personal religion, or true religiousness of character. In this sense it occurs in Matt. vi. 33, “the kingdom of God and his righteousness.” Thus the phrase corresponds with “unto holiness,” *εἰς ἁγιασμόν* in ver. 22. As felicity is the unvarying concomitant of such religion, the term affords a very sufficient antithesis to death, which expresses the idea of misery.

17. “Form of doctrine:” *Τύπος* has been supposed by some to mean a mould into which a substance is poured in order to give it proper shape. But the word in this sense never occurs in the New Testament, and the

18 κούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς· ἐλευ- θερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας 19 ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. Ἄν- θρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθέν- νειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν· ὥσπερ	the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteous- ness. I speak after the manner of 19
--	---

terms generally used by Greek writers to express this sense are *λίγδος* and *χοάνη*. Besides, the verbs would not be in keeping with such a figure. Form, sketch, outline, conveys the Apostle's idea, which he expresses also in 2 Tim. i. 13 by the similar word *ὑποτύψεις*.—The construction of the latter part of the verse is doubtful. Tholuck understands *ὑπηκούσατε* to be here, as it often is elsewhere, (see in Kypke examples from Appian and Josephus,) construed with *εἰς*, and resolves the expression into *ὑπηκούσατε εἰς τύπον διδαχῆς ὃς παρεδόθη ὑμῖν*, in compliance with the rule that verbs which in the active have the dative of the person, in the passive change that into the nominative. So Castalio: *paruistis ei doctrinae rationi, quæ vobis tradita est*. Our English translation seems to have been made in reference to the same principle: "Ye have obeyed that form of doctrine which was delivered you." But the marginal reading, which is in the original edition, is: "Whereto ye were delivered;" and this is also the reading, with slight varieties of verbal expression, in Wiclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, the Genevan and Rheims translations. These old English versions followed another construction, which is perhaps to be preferred. Although the verb *ὑπακούειν* elsewhere in the New Testament invariably governs the dative, yet it occurs in the Septuagint with the accusative and also with the genitive. See, among other instances, Deut. xxi. 18, xxvi. 14, 17. The construction may therefore be, *ὑπηκούσατε τύπον διδαχῆς εἰς ὃν*. If we are influenced by the dative usage of the New Testament, we may still regard the accusative of the noun as flowing by attraction from that of the relative. *Παραδίδωμι* may be taken in the sense of to teach, as it signifies in Luke i. 2, Acts vi. 14, 1 Cor. xi. 2. In the last text, the verb and the noun both occur, and though the latter is rendered in the text of our translation "ordinances" and in the margin "traditions," the true meaning is undoubtedly *instructions* delivered or taught by St. Paul himself. Thus also the same word ought to be rendered in 2 Thess. ii. 15: 'hold fast the *instructions* which you have been taught;' and in iii. 6, 'according to the *instruction* received from us.' Etymologically the word means directions or truths *delivered*. The best translation therefore of the clause is probably this: 'Ye have obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine in which ye were instructed.'—The Apostle thanks God for their obedience. Before "ye were," *although* is to be supplied. Comp. Matt. xi. 25: 'although thou hast hidden' &c.

men, because of the infirmity of your flesh; for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness, and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto
 20 holiness. For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from
 21 righteousness. What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of
 22 those things is death. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end,
 23 everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν
 δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνο-
 μίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, οὕτω νῦν
 παρστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦ-
 λα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν.
 Ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρ- 20
 τίας, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιο-
 σύνῃ. Τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἶχετε 21
 τότε ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε;
 τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος.
 Νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς 22
 ἁμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ
 θεῷ, ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς
 ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώ-
 νιον. Τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρ- 23
 τίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ
 θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ
 Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

18-23. Sin and righteousness are here personified and represented as masters of conflicting interests. The author remarks that he speaks in an ordinary human way, taking his illustrations from common life; and this in order the better to adapt himself to the weak condition of his readers. But he does not refer to it so much intellectually as spiritually. And this weak condition, be it observed, is not stated as peculiar to the Roman Christians, but is predicable of Christians of all ages in a greater or less degree. And hence it is that religious truth must ever be presented, not in the very best conceivable form, but in that which is best adapted to the condition of the party addressed. The weakness of our present sinful state is what is intended.—“To iniquity unto iniquity.” Comp. i. 17, “from faith to faith.” Increase is the idea in both cases. In the real Christian, faith ever grows; in the sinner, iniquity becomes stronger and stronger, verifying the terrific announcement, “he that is filthy, let him be filthy still.” Rev. xxii. 11. In the very truthful and striking language of Olshausen: “*Sin* continually brings forth *sin*, only she produces figures *ever more frightful* from her teeming womb. Even so does *righteousness* produce by degrees *more gloriously*, until she becomes *holiness*.”

On ver. 21, Griesbach and other critical editors place the interrogation point after then: ‘What fruit therefore had ye then?’ The usual punctuation, which appears in our Bibles, is, at least, as good. The reader can hardly fail to remark the antithesis between ὅτε, τότε, and νῦν, νυνὶ δέ, the one denoting the former sinful condition, and the other the present Christian state.—The word *end* is best understood in the sense of *reward*.

In ver. 23 *wages* and *free gift* are in evident contrast, the one expressing due desert, and the other unmerited gratuity. *Death* and *life* are also contrasted, the epithet of *eternal* being applied to the latter, as is done also in v. 21.

SECTION IX.

CHAP. VII.-VIII. 17.

THE LAW CAN NEITHER JUSTIFY NOR SANCTIFY. IT IS THE GOSPEL WHICH ALONE CAN MEET, IN THESE RESPECTS, THE WANTS OF MAN'S WEAK AND SINFUL CONDITION.

VII. Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί, (γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ,) ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion

CHAP. vii. Christians are not connected with the law, either as a means of acceptance with God or of their sanctification; for it can neither place men in such a state, nor give them grace to live a holy life. It can but show clearly the nature of sin, excite its propensities, and condemn the sinner. Freedom from the condemnation and dominion of sin, and acceptance with God, together with power to live a holy life, are peculiar to the Gospel. And hence results obligation on the part of the Christian to live in accordance with its nature, and also with a view to obtain its ultimate blessings.

The connection of justification and sanctification is here, as elsewhere in this Epistle, evidently implied and indeed avowed. The former is the principle and germ of the latter. The grace of justification developed in its practical efficacy necessarily produces sanctification. This fact of Christianity may account for the Apostle's transition from the one to the other, which thereby becomes perfectly natural.

Ver. 1. "I speak to them that know the law." For the various meanings which have been ascribed to the word law in this verse, I must refer the reader to the commentators. The Mosaic law in general, the ceremonial law in particular, the law of the marriage relation specially, have their respective advocates. It cannot be the ceremonial law, for the whole tenor of the chapter is opposed to such a supposition. Nor is there reason to limit it to the law respecting marriage, for what is said of this is confined to two or three verses, and is merely illustrative. The simplest and most natural sense would seem to be, moral law in general, not merely as existing or even as first promulgated by Moses; but as the law under which

- over a man as long as he liveth? ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ; Ἡ γὰρ 2
 2 For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her ὕπανδρος γυνή τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ
 husband, so long as he liveth; but δέδεται νόμῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ
 if the husband be dead, she is ὁ ἀνὴρ, κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ
 loosed from the law of her husband. νόμον τοῦ ἀνδρός. Ἄρα οὖν 3

man as a responsible creature of God always was and ever must be. The Apostle addresses himself to those who have a general knowledge of the application and bearing of moral law. The word is at first without the article, which however is employed on a renewed mention of the subject in the next clause. Comp. viii. 9, 11, where "spirit" occurs first without and then with the article, although expressive of precisely the same idea.

"As long as he liveth:" From the time of Origen to the present day, some interpreters have predicated this of the law, translating 'as long as it liveth,' that is, remaineth in force. But this is certainly a very harsh sense, and inadmissible, unless required by absolute necessity. To say that the law rules the man as long as it has force is not, indeed, a mere truism, but much nearer to one than can be allowed in such a writer as St. Paul. The advocates of this view have appealed to the following verses, where they suppose the man or husband to correspond with the law and the woman or wife with the Jews or those under the law. But the correctness of such correspondence cannot be proved, and of course any argument drawn from it is uncertain, and may be erroneous. The usual meaning, which appears in our common translation, is more in accordance with the language in 1 Cor. vii. 39, where the same phrase occurs with the additional words, "her husband." And in ver. 4, the persons addressed are said to be dead, not the law; and so in ver. 6, according to the true reading ἀποθανόντες, 'we having died.' The Apostle might undoubtedly have spoken of the law as dead; but he has chosen to express this condition as that of the persons. And so also of himself in Gal. ii. 19, "I am dead to the law." Perhaps he preferred this phraseology on account of his having before spoken of Christians as "dead to sin," vi. 2; and perhaps, also, from his reluctance to represent God's moral law as in any sense dead, since it contains within itself a principle of perpetual life.

2, 3. "From the law of her husband:" That is, from the law which binds her to her husband.—Ἐὰν γένηται—γενομένην· become to, that is, be married to. See Robinson under γινομαι I. 4, a) ad fin.—These two verses seem to be introduced as illustration, and merely to convey the thought that death dissolves the marriage obligation. It is neither necessary nor expedient to draw out the analogy any farther. Its application is made in the next verse. The general idea therefore appears to be this. 'As, in the marriage relation, the death of either party dissolves the obliga-

<p>ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς μοιχαλὶς χρη- ματίσει, ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευ- θέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα, γενο- 4 μένην ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ. "Ὡστε, ἀδελ- φοί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι,</p>	<p>So then, if, while <i>her</i> husband 3 liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulter- ess; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Where- 4 fore, my brethren, ye also are be- come dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be mar-</p>
---	--

tion entered into, so your (figurative) death to the law releases you from any connection with it as the instrumentality of your acceptance with and sanctification before God.'

The attempt to carry out the author's analogy into particular detail has given rise to a vast variety of theories. The reader who desires to become acquainted with them may perhaps find sufficient to gratify his curiosity in the notes of Tholuck and Olshausen, and the authors to whom they refer.

4. The Apostle now applies his comparison, and represents Christian believers as "dead to the law." He does not speak of it as a code of morals, which, although no human effort can attain to its perfect excellence, is notwithstanding to be perpetually set up as the divine standard (Matt. v. 17, 18), but rather as a means of acceptance with God. This accords with the general scope of the Epistle, and also with the particular one of this chapter.—"The body of Christ:" This means most certainly his literal personal body which was offered on the cross, and which thereby effected the figurative death here spoken of. This death, like that of the one married party which releases the other from previous obligation, prepares the way for your becoming connected with another, him who hath been raised from the dead. Stripped of all figure, the idea is, that Christ's atonement enables us to look for acceptance and sanctification to a vital union with him. Thence (to resume again the figure,) proceeds the legitimate offspring of this spiritual alliance, namely, the fruits of good works tending to advance God's glory.

5, 6. These verses express two contrary states, one, that of fallen sinful nature; the other, that of Christian character elevated by the Gospel to a new and spiritual service of God.—"In the flesh:" This does not mean under the law, in a legal condition merely; as some have explained it, referring to such places as Rom. iv. 1, Gal. iii. 3, Heb. ix. 10, and other texts of the same kind where the law and its external ordinances are represented as fleshly. According to the common use of the phrase it means 'his sinful condition' under the influence of carnal lusts. Thus in vii. 18, "in me, that is, in my flesh;" in viii. 8, 9, "they who are in the flesh—ye are

<p>ried to another, <i>even</i> to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.</p> <p>5 For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the</p>	<p>ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ. Ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ 5 παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου, ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ καρποφο-</p>
--	--

not in the flesh ;” in Eph. ii. 11, “ Gentiles in the flesh.” No doubt the persons spoken of were under the law ; but the sinfulness of their character while in such a condition, is the particular point which the phrase denotes.

“ The passions of sins ;” that is sinful passions.—“ Which were by the law :” Locke and Macknight translate : ‘ under the law,’ which the Greek unquestionably admits. But the common translation is nevertheless preferable. For the Apostle intending to display the law as exhibiting to transgressors the nature of sin and its effects on the awakened conscience, as his argument led him and as he does in vs. 7 et seq., here speaks of sinful passions as developing themselves in action by the law, although he means that the law made their sinfulness the more conspicuous, and became the occasion of their being excited to their natural course of opposition. Thus in Matt. x. 34, 35, the coming of Christ is said to do what it merely gave occasion to sinful human passions to perpetrate. This view gives point to the question in ver. 7, “ is the law sin ?” Such an objection implying the most thorough *reductio ad absurdum*, might very plausibly be raised on the representation that sinful passions were *by* the law, but not on account of their being said to exist *under* it. In this way too the phrase retains uniformly the same sense, whereas Locke and Macknight are obliged to translate it differently in different places. Thus in ver. 5 and 8, they translate *διά* *under* or *during*, in ver. 7 *through* or *by*, and in ver. 11 where it occurs twice, they employ both words. Besides, according to their interpretation, which explains the phrase “ in the flesh” of “ the state of the Jews under the law of Moses,” both phrases express exactly the same thing.—“ In our members.” This is equivalent to the more general expression, in our body ; though it may be employed to mark the relation between particular members and certain sins, in the commission of which they become instrumental.—“ To bring forth fruit unto death :” Such is the result of a natural sinful condition, and it is here placed in evident contrast with the result of the Christian’s union with Christ, as expressed in the previous verse under a figure drawn from the marriage relation.

In opposition to the sinful condition before described, the author proceeds to say as follows : ‘ But now, we, having died, have become freed from the law in (or by) which we were held.’ The common reading is *ἀποθανόντος*, which being in the genitive singular, refers, of course, to *νόμον*. This is followed by our English translation : “ the law, that being dead.” But the marginal reading in the original edition has “ being dead to

- 6 ρῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ. Νυνὶ δὲ law, did work in our members to
κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, bring forth fruit unto death. But 6
ἀποθανόντες, ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα, now we are delivered from the law,
ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινό- that being dead wherein we were
τητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιό- held; that we should serve in new-
τητι γράμματος. ness of spirit, and not *in* the oldness
7 Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὁ νόμος ἁμαρ- of the letter.
τία; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρ- What shall we say then? *Is* the 7

that." And so Tyndale and Cranmer: "We are delivered from the law, and deed from that (unto it: C.) whereunto we were in bondage." Also the Genevan: "we are delivered from the lawe being dead *unto yt*." As usual, Wiclif and the Rheims agree with the Vulgate and other Latin authorities, *soluti sumus a lege mortis*, the former having, "we ben unbounden fro the lawe of deeth," and the latter, "we are loosed from the law of death." The other English versions before cited follow the true reading *ἀποθανόντες*, which is supported by the best ancient manuscripts and versions, also by the figurative language of the author in the immediate context.—"Newness of spirit, oldness of letter." These phrases denote the new, spiritual dispensation of the Gospel, and the old one of the Law, the merely outward and literal sense of which showed its imperfection. The former is the development of the full spiritual meaning of the latter and of what it adumbrated. In 2 Cor. iii. 6, the Apostle employs the same language: "Not of the letter but of the spirit; for the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." That is, the law condemns and punishes, but the Gospel acquits and favours with unmerited blessings.

7. "What shall we say then? is the law sin?" The force of the question results from the representation made in ver. 5, of the law becoming the occasion of sin, which had been stated in the terms, 'sinful passions which were *by* the law.' The imputation is promptly rejected. Yet sin is made known by the law: and the tenth commandment is alleged as an illustration of this: The law is not sin. No, certainly: but it gives a fuller consciousness of sin, than otherwise I could have, and becomes the occasion of my sinful propensity operating on me in opposition to law. "Not only is the law not a teacher of sin, but it is sin's accuser." Theodore, Opera, Tom. iii. p. 53.

As the Apostle now employs the first person, and continues to employ it until the third verse of the next chapter, this seems to be a proper place to examine whether he speaks particularly of himself, or personifies a character; and, if he does speak of himself, whether he describes his Christian condition, or a state antecedent thereto.

That St. Paul cannot intend to limit to himself what he here says, is most probable, inasmuch as he manifestly depicts the experience of a class;

law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not	τίαν οὐκ ἔγνων, εἰ μὴ διὰ νό-
known sin, but by the law: for I had	μον · τήν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ
not known lust, except the law had	ᾔδειν, εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν · οὐκ

and, as his statement applies to himself as well as to all others of the class described, and as he employs the first person, it would seem unreasonable to exclude him from the class intended. It is of little consequence, as regards the interpretation of the whole portion, whether he is speaking of himself as an individual of a class, or whether he personifies such class. But the other point of discussion has a direct bearing on the interpretation of the portion, namely, whether it is the really Christian state of the party spoken of, or an antecedent one, which is here intended; whether it be a regenerate or ante-regenerate condition. Olshausen says, that all expositors agree that “7–13 applies to the state before regeneration, as the Apostle indicates by the aorist that the state is gone by. But whether 14–24 is also to be so considered is uncertain, since in this section Paul makes use of the *present* only, while viii. 2, &c. the aorist again appears.” The argument from the change of tense does not seem to be of much force, as the change naturally arises from the author’s method of representing his subject. Divines, both of ancient and modern times, have differed respecting the main point. Among the fathers, Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, state the ante-regeneration view, while Augustin and others maintain the opposite theory. Modern theologians, from the time of the Reformation, have also differed in the same way. It is impossible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion on this particular, by settling the possible meaning of some phrases which may occur in the latter portion. While it is certainly susceptible of proof that the language, “carnal—sold under sin,” and much of the accompanying description, are strictly inapplicable to the inwardly regenerate Christian; yet the Scriptures supply us with many instances of most pious men, such, for instance, as Daniel, Job, and David, applying similar language to themselves as expressions of penitential confession; and such expressions of self-abasement have always characterized the holiest. Yet, on the other hand, the fact that language of this kind is used by such men in the way of penitent confession, will not authorise the inference, that it is intended of them when it occurs in a logical train of argument. The scope and general design of the author afford therefore the best clew to ascertain his meaning; and this I have endeavoured to present in the analysis. I shall now attempt to explain the portion in accordance with the view there given.

The Apostle is speaking of the state of a person before he becomes a Christian. He describes the conflict of such a one’s natural feelings and passions with his reason, conscience, and imperfect knowledge of God’s law. Still, as the same imperfect condition and sinful tendency exist,

<p>8 ἐπιθυμήσεις. Ἀφορμὴν δὲ λα- βοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπι- θυμίαν· χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρ- 9 τία νεκρά. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς</p>	<p>said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, 8 taking occasion, by the command- ment wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin <i>was</i> dead. For I was alive 9</p>
---	---

though in a modified degree, even in the truest Christian, it is very probable that the sacred author expresses himself in language drawn from his own Christian experience at different times, and such language may well be used of the regenerate, as suitably depicting their inward emotions. All this may be allowed, while it may still be maintained, that the Apostle's argument compels us to give one definite exposition of his words, and to maintain that they describe one clearly marked condition. The view of Olshausen is worthy of attentive consideration. "The Apostle sets out, vii. 9, from a state in which the man is living entirely without law, and closes viii. 11, with the glorification of the bodily substance. The question occurs here, how many stages of development are properly distinguished? *Four* clearly present themselves. *First*, a life without law, in which sin is (comparatively) dead; *next*, a life under the law, in which sin becomes alive and has dominion; *further*, a state, in which by the power of Christ, the spirit has dominion and sin is (in a great degree) mastered; *finally*, the state of the entire separation of sin by the glorification of the bodily substance."

8. "Sin:" Not the overt act of sin, but the sinful principle, which is so far personified as to be represented as an agent. "Taking occasion, by the commandment wrought in me." Most likely the phrase, "by the commandment," should be connected with the words that immediately follow. Thus the sentiment will be, that sin, by means of the commandment wrought, &c. And this certainly agrees best with the eleventh verse, which connects "the commandment" with "wrought," for it is there said, "by the commandment deceived me, and by it slew me."—Sin is the agent that works all ἐπιθυμίαν, that is, all illicit desire.—"Without the law sin is dead." This is true absolutely. If there were no moral law at all, there could be no living and active sin at all. And the same is true in all the degrees in which sin can be conceived to exist. The sin is in proportion to the moral law as known or capable of being known.

9, 10. "I was alive:" Does this language express simply the fact that the speaker was at one time living without a right appreciation of the character and bearing of God's moral law. Such a supposition would agree with the context, and give a correct exposition. The Apostle may intend to say merely this, that antecedently to the time of which he is speaking, he, or the party spoken of, was passing his existence without a right estimate of the nature and purport of God's law. Still, the antithesis with the

without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin re-
 10 vived, and I died. And the com-
 mandment, which *was ordained* to

νόμον ποτέ· ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς
 ἐντολῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν,
 ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον· καὶ εὐρέθη 10
 μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν, αὕτη

language of the next verse, "I died," does seem to demand a fuller sense. "I died," expresses, certainly, a consciousness of being condemned, and in a state of moral and penal death. It would seem most reasonable, then, to give to the antithetic phrase, "I was living," a meaning somewhat analogous, thus: 'I was not properly conscious of sin, I did not experience the influence of law as the occasion of its action, the influence of law either on my perceptions of the character of sin, or in becoming the instrumentality of rousing my sinful passions into life and energy.'

"But, when the commandment came;" or, the commandment having come. According to Tholuck on ver. 8, ἐντολή means the particular commandment not to covet, and thus in Heb. vii. 18 the commandment has been restricted to the law of the priesthood. See my note there, which is intended to show that in both places it is better to take the word in its most comprehensive sense as equivalent to νόμος, law. There is not sufficient reason for the limitation. On the contrary, what is applicable to *law* being predicated also of *commandment*, the probability is that both are equally general in meaning. The coming of the commandment is not to be explained in reference to the historical introduction of the Mosaic law at Mount Sinai. The chief objection to this interpretation is not that it involves an unnatural figure, as the Apostle would then represent his personified character as living before the time of the Mosaic law, through its whole period, and into the Christian dispensation. If he personates human nature in different states, such a representation will be allowable, although, at first view, it may appear incongruous. But, as the different conditions and states of mind here described existed, beyond all doubt, in a greater or less degree, among individuals, whether living before or during or after the Mosaic dispensation, it becomes necessary to take some view of the phrase which will accord with this fact. Doubtless the Apostle speaks of the influence of law on the awakening conscience, to which it comes home, as we say with a natural depth of meaning founded in truth, enlightening, impressing, and warning. To the same purpose, Gal. iii. 23, 25: "Before faith came, after that faith is come." The idea here intended cannot be limited to the historical coming of the Gospel. It expresses also the liberating influence of faith on the believer's mind.—'Sin revived, but I died, and the very commandment which was intended to produce happiness was found to result in misery.' "Sin" is the carnal principle in our fallen nature, and the "I" is the better part of the man, his rational spiritual principle under the influence, in a greater or less degree, of conscience and

- 11 εἰς θάνατον. Ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία life, I found *to be* unto death. For 11
 ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντο- sin, taking occasion, by the com-
 λῆς ἐξηπάτησέ με καὶ δι' αὐτῆς mandment deceived me, and by it
 12 ἀπέκτεινεν. Ὡστε ὁ μὲν νόμος slew *me*. Wherefore the law is 12
 ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ holy; and the commandment holy,
 13 δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή. Τὸ οὖν ἀγα- and just, and good. Was then 13

moral law, as impressed thereon.—The phrases, “sin revived,” or, became active, dominant; and, “I died,” are manifestly antithetic. As the one gains or exerts strength, the other feels its own weakness in a proportionably increasing degree, and recognises also its ruined condition.

11, 12. “Sin,” in other words, the carnal principle. It “deceived me:” The insidious character of sin is what is here intended. There may be an allusion to the words of Eve in the Septuagint of Gen. iii. 13, “the serpent beguiled me,” ἡπάτησέ με. This same carnal principle is also here represented as the source of that death of which in the former clause, the law is said to have been the occasion. Here the language is, “sin slew me,” ἀπέκτεινε; in 2 Cor. iii. 6, it is, “the letter (meaning the law,) killeth,” ἀποκτείνει. In the one text, the law is said to do what, in the other, is ascribed to the carnal principle or fallen nature. Language of this kind is usual in common life, and abounds also in Holy Scripture. Thus we read that “God hardened Pharaoh’s heart,” that “Pharaoh hardened his heart,” and “that the heart of Pharaoh was hardened;” (Exod. vii. 13, viii. 32, vii. 14;) the last phrase expressing the ostensible and undeniable fact, the preceding one, the personal agency of the man himself, and the first the divine permission. Perhaps the most striking instance of this kind of language may be found in the scriptural account of David’s numbering the people. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, it is said, that “the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, go number Israel” &c.; while the same thing in 1 Chron. xxi. 1, is ascribed to the Devil: “Satan stood up against Israel and provoked David to number Israel.” The theory whereby such seemingly contradictory declarations are reconciled, is the very simple one, of the agent speaking or acting as the principal: qui facit per alium facit per se. Thus, in the case under consideration, the law is the occasion, sinful passion the cause. “By the commandment,” and “by it,” are evidently connected respectively with the verb that follows; and, as was before said, determine the connection of the phrase, “by the commandment,” in the 8th verse, to be with the subsequent verb. Thus it is evident from the foregoing representation, that the law is in all respects, excellent, and not at all the cause of sin, however it may have been the occasion of developing and even of exciting it.

13. Nothing now could be more natural, than to repel the idea that God’s moral law, which must be essentially good, could become the cause

that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might be-
 14 come exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual; but
 θὸν ἐμοὶ γέγονε θάνατος; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία· ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον, ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. Οἶδαμεν γάρ, ὅτι ὁ νόμος 14 πνευματικός ἐστιν· ἐγὼ δὲ σαρ-

of ruin. Such is the thought in the first clause of this verse. *Τὸ ἀγαθόν*. Emphatically, the good thing, the very counterpart of him whom it describes and emanates from, and of whom alone, personally considered, it can in its fullest sense be affirmed. Comp. Matt. xix. 17.

Ἡ ἁμαρτία, like *τὸ ἀγαθόν*, is the subject of a verb, which may be and probably is *γέγονε*. If so, the meaning will be: 'not the good (law of God), but sin became the cause of my ruin.' Thus the punctuation may be (but this is not necessary,) that which Griesbach has introduced, namely a colon after *ἡ ἁμαρτία*. In this case, the anarthrous *ἁμαρτία* which follows, may be nominative to *φανῇ*. Then *φανῇ* and *κατεργαζομένη* may be connected, and the construction be thus: 'that sin might appear working' &c.; or, without such connection, that sin, working death by means of the good (law) might appear, that is, that its true nature might become known.—But the verse admits another construction, which, as it preserves the ordinary usage of the article with the subject and omits it with the predicate, seems preferable. According to it, the thought runs thus: 'Was then the good (law) the cause of my ruin? Certainly not; but sin, that it might appear sin, (was) working my ruin by means of the good (law,) that (or so that,) by means of the commandment, sin might appear (be seen to be,) excessively sinful.' According to this view *ἦν* is to be understood with the participle *κατεργαζομένη*; or this might be considered as expressive of the present tense, as in Hebrew.—Still, there is another construction, which is probably the best. According to it, *ἡ ἁμαρτία*, as I said before, becomes the subject of *γέγονε*, and the next line, closely connected with it, expresses the development of sin and its ruinous effects. The sense which results is as follows: 'Was then the good (law) the cause of my ruin? Certainly not; but sin (was the cause of it,) which "that it might appear sin," in other words, to show (or showing) its character, wrought ruin by means of the good (law), thus displaying its detestable nature.' The concluding clause of the verse from the second *ἵνα*, is merely a fuller exhibition of the last idea.

14. The Apostle's mind dwells on the absurd suggestion which he had before in ver. 7, indignantly repelled, "is the law sin?" and which he had just denied. The illative particle "for" here used implies the confutation already made. On the contrary, we know God's law to be spiritual. The

<p>κικός εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν 15 ἁμαρτίαν. Ὁ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι οὐ γινώσκω· οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὃ μισῶ τοῦτο 16 ποιῶ. Εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω τοῦτο ποιῶ, σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ, ὅτι κα- 17 λός. Νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατερ- γάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν 18 ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. Οἶδα γάρ, ὅτι</p>	<p>I am carnal, sold under sin. For 15 that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I 16 do that which I would not, I con- sent unto the law that <i>it</i> is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, 17 but sin that dwelleth in me. For I 18</p>
--	--

word denotes superiority, excellence in the highest degree, and the noun is often employed in the same sense. See note on John vi. 63, in the Essay on our Lord's Discourse at Capernaum, p. 101.—“But I am carnal, sold under sin.” This expresses our natural inability, subjection to fleshly inclinations and sinful indulgence. In the last phrase, some have imagined an allusion to the Roman usage of selling property *sub hasta*. But it is much more probable that sin is personified and represented as a master to whom the wretched man had become a slave, compelled to obey his behests. This is in harmony with the language in the former chapter, where righteousness and iniquity are represented under the same figure. We have the phrase also in the Old Testament. Thus Ahab and others are said to have “sold themselves to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord,” 1 Kings xxi. 20, 25, 2 Kings xvii. 17; and the same is said of wicked and abandoned men in 1 Macc. i. 15, “They were sold to do mischief.” The figure denotes most undoubtedly a state of subserviency to sin as to a despot lording it over the imbecile, subjugated wretch, and is therefore quite incompatible with the desirable condition of Christian freedom.

15–20. What follows is a vivid and graphical description of the perceptions and feelings which arise in the soul of the man who is just beginning to experience the influence of God's moral law on his spiritual being. I shall first note such particulars as seem to require elucidation, and then state the result in a paraphrase.

Here Olshausen again calls the attention of the reader to the change of the tense, from the past before employed, to the present, which follows to the end of the chapter. Hence he concludes that the subsequent representation is of a more general nature than the preceding, and comprehends the conflicts even of the regenerate mind, the man in his Christian state. I have already remarked that the use of the present is quite natural. It makes the exhibition the more graphical, and brings the personified condition directly before the mind. It seems also to arise spontaneously from the statement made in the 14th verse, that “the law is spiritual,” which, expressing a present as well as a past and also an immutable fact, is naturally followed by a description of a present conflict in the carnal man. It

know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I

οὐκ οἶκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθόν· τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειται μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν· οὐχ εὕρισκω. Οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω, ποιῶ 19

is not to be questioned that some passages may be applicable to a Christian state, and perhaps the conflicts of this state which the author had experienced, did suggest or modify the language; but it does not follow from any part of the description, that the conflicts of the regenerate were intended to be portrayed.

Γινώσκω may retain its usual meaning, *to know*, provided it be regarded as emphatic, declaring a want of proper knowledge of the cause, full character, and results of what is done. But another meaning is also supported by usage, *to regard kindly, to like, to approve of*. This has been objected to on the ground that it produces a tautology, as the same idea is expressed by the word *will*. To this it might be replied that the particle *for* in the latter half of the verse may, as well as that in the former, be illative of the condition expressed in the verse preceding. Still this is unnecessary; for certainly one may give as a reason for not approving a course of action, that it is opposed to his inclination.

Σύμφημι· literally, I speak along with; that is, I concur with.—“But now:” This is not so much a notation of time, as a formula introducing what has a close and logical connection with what had preceded. See the note on Heb. viii. 6.—“No more:” This must not be regarded as implying that the speaker, the I, according to the Apostle’s phrase, had formerly done himself what he now ascribes to indwelling sin. It rather intimates that he is *not at all* to be regarded as the agent. The I is the better part of the man, his reason and conscience. This better part is enslaved by the sinfulness of fallen nature, and, in despite of it, the tyrannical master carries out his iniquitous opposition to the holy law.

“In me, that is, in my flesh:” The highly figurative representation which pervades the whole portion compels the author to make an occasional transition. Sometimes the pronoun designates the better, sometimes the worse part of the personified man. Before it was the former; here it is the latter, as he himself explains it.—“Flesh:” That is, the carnal nature, the sinful tendency; so called doubtless from its inferior, corrupting and degrading tendencies, and therefore often set in contradistinction to spirit. Comp. John iii. 6, “that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit;” and Gal. v. 17, “the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh.” In this carnality of nature there is no good; evil is its essential element, or rather its very substance. The Apostle, however, does not here speak entirely in the abstract;

<p>ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' ὃ οὐ θέλω κακόν, 20 τοῦτο πράσσω. Εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω ἐγώ, τοῦτο ποιῶ, οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κα- τεργάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκοῦσα 21 ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. Εὕρισκω ἄρα</p>	<p>would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do 20 that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that when 21</p>
---	--

for he proceeds to say, that, in the condition all along before spoken of, his wish accords with the law, but he is incompetent to carry it out in holy obedience.—“To will:” This word may express the bent of the whole inner man, according to which the individual shall be influenced both in character and conduct. Or it may denote merely the inefficient wish or desire, not followed by any corresponding character or conduct. In this latter sense it must be understood here and in the context, as the slightest examination will evince.—At the commencement of the clause, the word *although* should be supplied. Many very important authorities omit οὐχ εὕρισκω, and read simply οὐ. The idea may then be thus expressed: ‘Although the desire is present with me, the doing what is good is not.’—This is followed by a repetition of what had been before said, with the view probably of strengthening the impression, and perhaps also in order to intimate the painfulness of the condition by dwelling on the description.

The general sense of these verses seems to be as follows: ‘I do not approve of what I do; for I do not do the thing that I wish, on the contrary I do that I hate. In the very act then of doing what I do not wish to do, I acquiesce in the excellence of God’s law, which commands the contrary to what I reluctantly do. This being so, it may well be said, that it is by no means I that do it, my reason and conscience take no part in the action; this is attributable to the sinfulness of my nature, which ever clings to and lords it over me. For, alas! in my natural condition, thus under the influence of sin, there is nothing spiritually good. The desire indeed exists, but it is followed by no practical result in effecting anything good. A repetition of what has before been said, can alone describe so miserable a condition.’

21–24. The construction of the Greek is difficult, owing somewhat to the position of the words and somewhat to the repetition of the pronoun, which result in the want of an easy grammatical or rhetorical flow.—The literal unpointed translation is as follows: ‘I find then the law to me wishing to do the good that the bad is present to me.’ Griesbach and Hahn places the comma after *good*. If it be placed after *law*, the word *that* would be more properly introduced immediately after it. The law here mentioned is the evil tendency of fallen nature before represented as resistless. Under its influence the desire to do what is good is overruled and becomes inoperative. This law or ruling tendency is called in ver. 23 the “law in the members,” and “the law of sin.” The former phrase seems to have arisen

I would do good, evil is present 22 with me. For I delight in the law 23 of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members,	τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἔμοι ποί- εἶν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἔμοι τὸ κακὸν παράκειται. Συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ 22 νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄν- θρωπον, βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον 23
---	--

from the figurative view of *body, flesh*, as the instrumentality by which the sinfulness of nature develops its character in overt acts. The members are the integral parts of which the body, the flesh, is the aggregate. The three expressions denote the fallen, sinful character of man. This one three-named law stands in contrast to the law of God, which is evidently his moral law, or the law of the mind, that is, the same law so far as made known to the man's reason and conscience.

"I delight in the law of God after the inward man." In order to have a clear comprehension of the Apostle's representation, it is necessary to understand rightly what he means by the inward man. Ordinary readers of the Bible very generally suppose this to be identical with the internal religious character, "the new man," the grown or at least the growing divine life in the spiritual nature, that which is "created in righteousness and true holiness," (Eph. iv. 24,) in the soul by the operation of the Holy Spirit. Hence, as is quite natural, they cannot conceive it possible that the Apostle can be speaking of any but a regenerate person, one in whom Christian divine life has already begun. Of such a one alone can this inward man be presumed, and this delight in God's moral law be affirmed. But the major proposition in this argument is unwarrantably assumed, and of course the conclusion drawn therefrom is unfounded. The inward (or inner) man is a phrase which occurs only three times in the New Testament. In 2 Cor. iv. 16, it is placed in contrast to "our outward man," that is, evidently, our body. The meaning is undoubtedly this: 'though our frail body dies and perishes, yet our soul is renewed, its divine life is continued and strengthened by the influence of our Christian hopes and character.' But the inward man is not identical with this character. In Eph. iii. 16, the same phraseology occurs: "strengthened with might in the inner man:" that is, in the soul, the spiritual part of the individual. In this same sense is the language of the text to be explained: "according to the inward man," that is, my soul, my spirit is under the influence of its reason and conscience.

Professor Hodge maintains the other view of the phrase. "The delight is restricted to the *inward man*, and not spoken of the soul generally. As the term *inward man* meant at first the soul in opposition to the body, and as the former is superior to the latter, it naturally became expressive of excellence, and when opposed to something in the soul, indicates its renewed or better feelings." He then refers to the texts in Ephesians and Corinthians,

ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου. Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος

warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I 24

explaining the first by "their holy affections being confirmed," and adding to the last as follows: "In all these and similar passages, the phrase includes the idea of excellence. When opposed to the body, it is the soul; but when opposed to something in the mind, as in this passage to 'the law in the members,' it means the better feelings or principles."

That *the soul* is the original meaning of the phrase is here admitted. That it ever "indicates its renewed feelings" cannot be proved. Its "better" element it may indicate. But this may just as well be understood of its reason and moral sense as of its regenerated Christian character, which I presume is meant by the phrase, "renewed feelings." In connection with the first passage quoted, "inner man" and "holy affections" are represented as identical. But this inner man is not the holy affections themselves, but rather that spiritual part of man in which the Holy Spirit has planted holy affections. In the last, "the inward man" is plainly antithetic to "the outer man." According to the author's view, the former means "the renewed feelings" or "holy affections;" and consequently the latter must mean the carnal sinful nature. But the whole context shows that this cannot be its meaning. The Apostle has just been speaking of persecutions, distresses and imminent dangers, which threatened him with death. Most undoubtedly it is the body which he represents as perishing; and therefore it must be the soul which he speaks of as constantly renewed. If by the "outward man" the sinful tendency in fallen nature was meant, the Apostle's language would have been that of triumph at the destruction of a deadly and spiritual foe; whereas his expression is evidently one of resignation: "We faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet the inward is renewed day by day." And the same idea is repeated in the next verse: "For our light affliction," &c. The Professor quotes also 1 Pet. iii. 4, "the hidden man of the heart." But the phrase and meaning are both different. The language then which is here employed by no means implies or expresses the regenerated Christian character. It is true also of the mind in its natural state of susceptibility to appreciate in some right degree God's moral law.

The spiritual nature of the character here described affirms, "I delight" in this law. Literally the word *συνήδομαι* signifies, 'I am pleased with,' and it is not necessary to give it any stronger meaning. Thus it need not be regarded as expressing any more than the word before employed in ver. 16, "I consent to," 'speak in unison with.' The mouth merely utters what the heart dictates. Still it may well be allowed that, becoming more warmed with

am! who shall deliver me from the πὸς · τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώ-
ματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου;

the subject, and being desirous of stating as fully as possible the complete acquiescence of reason and enlightened conscience in the excellency of God's moral law, the Apostle prefers a stronger term. It does not express the idea of conformity, but it does that of approbation. For it must not be forgotten, that the personified character is not the gross, sensual, abandoned sinner, recklessly stifling his moral feeling in habitual iniquity. St. Paul is not speaking of the careless, profligate offender, but of the man whose reason is being acted on and whose conscience is becoming alive to religious obligation.

The result of the contest between the predominating sinful tendency and the perceptions and impotent wishes of the reason and conscience is expressed by the phrase "bringing me into captivity." The noble part of our nature, which would be free, cannot resist its domineering tyrant, and lies prostrate as an enslaved and manacled captive. Hence the burst of natural feeling, "O wretched man &c. ! who shall deliver me ?" "Me miserable, which way shall I fly !"

"The body of this death;" or 'this body of death,' according to the marginal reading in the authorised translation. The pronoun may qualify either of the nouns. It is connected with the former by Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva version. According to this connection, the phrase will be Hebraistic; 'this body of death,' for 'this deadly body.' If the other be followed, the meaning will be as in our translation. Some commentators have supposed that the Apostle alludes to a disgusting and horrible punishment, said to have been inflicted during a state of savage barbarism, by fastening a dead, corrupting body to the living victim. Virgil speaks of it as having been practised by Mezentius. See *Æneid*, viii. 485-488. The figure would most forcibly illustrate the permanent adherence and deadly nature of the sinfulness thus described.—Others maintain that the body, properly speaking, is intended, but "the body subject to corruption."* Tholuck compares the phrase with that in Col. ii. 11, "the body of the sins of the flesh," and remarks that, in the one place, the body is represented as combined with the flesh, and, in the other, with death. Schoettgen† and others regard the phrase as a periphrasis for death, expressing its *substance*, *reality*, as the Hebrew writers employ the words גִּוְהַם, מִצְעָה. See the note on ii. 15, p. 36.—But another view seems preferable. The terms body, flesh, members, are indeed often used in their literal meaning, as in vi. 12, 13, and elsewhere. But they are also used figuratively to denote carnal or sinful nature, the one expressing its aggregate, and the other its particulars or the sins which spring from them. See vi. 6, vii. 18, and Col. iii. 5.

* Olshausen.

† Hor. Heb. in loc. p. 524.

25 εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ body of this death? I thank God, 25

It is from the entire carnal and sinful nature, therefore, that deliverance is here most earnestly desired.

25. The first clause of this verse makes a complete close of the topic before brought forward. It is the expression of joyous exultation in the truth which the words imply, and thus announce even more strongly than if they had simply declared it. It is of little consequence whether we read, "I thank God," or, according to very respectable authorities, 'thanks (be) to God.' In either case the sense is the same. The former agrees best with the general construction of the preceding context. The personified man of the foregoing representation still makes his presence felt, and appears in his assumed individuality: "I thank God!" Some ancient authorities read the Greek so as to make the words a direct answer to the question, thus: 'the grace of God,' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ. But either of the other readings harmonizes better with the deep feeling of the context, and the last is very much like the gloss of some dull reader, who would substitute a direct prosaic reply for the answer of a mind deeply imbued with poetical feeling, and excited by those grateful emotions which express themselves voluntarily and almost unconsciously, in the outbursting of unfettered nature rather than in the calm and measured phraseology of cool, logical propriety. The common reading is the best, both on the ground of external and internal evidence.

Here it may be well to stop a moment in order to recal to mind some particulars contained in this chapter, either by direct expression or necessary implication.

1. It is plain from the Apostle's remarks, that he describes a class of men as living without any right consideration of the real nature and practical bearing of God's moral law: "I was alive without the law once." The truth of this statement need not be proved, however much it may be deplored. And is the Apostle's description to be limited to unconverted Jews or Heathens? The answer may be found in the fact, that numbers of Christian people, so called, seem to have no adequate idea of the divine claim on their obedience, or of their own habitual failure in complying therewith. They live on, carelessly and joyously, and would perhaps be both surprised and affronted, if any one should presume to charge them with profound ignorance respecting the extent of the demands of the law, which claims their obedience, and which condemns the offender.

2. The next point brought prominently forward is, that moral law discloses the nature of sin: "I had not known sin, but by the law." The illustration which follows is taken from a single commandment, but the principle laid down is in its application universal. All sins are properly made known only by the operation of God's law; and this very fact shows

through Jesus Christ our Lord. So . Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Ἄρα

its perfection. The law then awakens the conscience to a due sense of that natural sinfulness which rules in every man not religious. This being so, the law is preparatory to the Gospel. In other words, it is "our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ," Gal. iii. 24. "Schoolmaster:" rather *pedagogue*, for the word implies *harsh discipline*, and is therefore in 1 Cor. iv. 15, set in contrast with *parental affection*.

3. Thirdly, the Apostle recognises the fact, which indeed is undeniable though continually lost sight of by some theoretical and dogmatical commentators and theologians, namely, that men not religious do nevertheless feel and acknowledge the excellence of God's moral law. We may see this truth illustrated and evinced in the case of any class or grade of offenders. Who ever conversed with a sinner, however abandoned, who, in his thoughtful, serious moments, did not assent to the excellence of true religion, and bitterly lament his own want of it? St. Paul portrays his pictures from real life, and his characters are the very image of the breathing originals. Many of his would-be improvers draw largely on an over excited imagination, or some stereotyped educational idea unsupported by fact.

4. Fourthly, the Apostle's train of thought most certainly teaches the great truth, that in fallen human nature there is no spiritual good. That is, there is no religious and godly internal disposition, fitting the soul for the enjoyment of future blessedness. Good, in varied and modified senses, no doubt belongs to fallen nature. Parental and filial affection is certainly a good; and so also are many other amiable natural properties, which give a zest to the enjoyments of human life. But some of these qualities humanity shares with the brute creation, and while they are good in their place, they do not form a part of that good of which the Apostle is speaking. The ordinary progressive movements of the physical economy in accordance with the laws imposed by the God of nature; the planetary revolutions; the formations in the vegetable, animal and mineral kingdoms, are all good: that is, they are in obedience to the laws of nature imposed by their all-wise and omnipotent creator. But the good of which the Apostle speaks is that of a moral, intellectual, and responsible being. It is a religious good, which fits such a being for assimilating with and enjoying God both here and hereafter. A good like this belongs not to fallen man. It is not at all connatural. It is wholly superinduced by the influence of God's Spirit; and this influence was procured solely by the merits of Christ and flows to weak humanity in no other channel than that which his satisfactory atonement has opened.

5. Further, the remarks of the Apostle suggest a reflection respecting the religious condition of the truly pious who lived anterior to the historical

οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῦ δου- then, with the mind I myself serve

development of the Gospel dispensation. The condition under the law is often mentioned as one of utter spiritual inability, destitution and condemnation, and as such is contrasted with that under grace or the Gospel, as one of communicated strength, and rich abundance, and gracious acceptance. The texts which speak such language are so numerous as to make any reference unnecessary. But they all express the nature and results of the respective states in themselves considered, not in reference to the historical existence of the two dispensations known as the Law and the Gospel. Christianity has indeed been historically and fully developed by Jesus Christ and his Apostles; but it was originally made known, though imperfectly, in the promise that immediately succeeded the fall. Dispensations anterior to the Gospel, whatever they may have been in themselves, were not imposed in order to exclude the influence and operation of that gracious system, which was even then partially known. Comp. Heb. iv. 2, 3. As it follows therefore that the condition of a man living under the legal dispensation is not necessarily a legal condition; so, on the other hand, that of many Christians so called may not be an evangelical one. When the Scripture speaks of the law as without grace and condemning, and the Gospel as justifying and saving, it describes their respective characters in the abstract. But, in former dispensations the sincere and religious believer was not under the law in the sense in which St. Paul uses the phrase, but under grace, although indeed as a system this had not been completely promulged. And in the present glorious evangelical dispensation, he who lacks a living faith, though ostensibly connected with it, is nevertheless under law and condemned by its righteous sentence.

6. Lastly, the connection in which this chapter and the first part of the next stand with the main scope of the Epistle, tends to sustain in general the above exposition. The author shows in detail, what is also elsewhere frequently stated or implied in Scripture, the inefficacy of the Law as such to meet the exigencies occasioned by man's fallen condition. Three things the Law can do. It can develop the nature of sin; it can become the occasion of rousing up natural sinful passions against its holy and divine requisitions; and it can condemn the sinner to merited punishment. But in the great work which is absolutely essential to his well being, the work of his salvation, it can do nothing. It has no forgiveness to offer, no state of justification and acceptance to promise, no divine aid without which sanctification is unattainable to give. All these necessary preliminaries to or elements of salvation can only be secured through Christ. This latter point, which is implied in the burst of thanksgiving, is distinctly and fully brought out in the beginning of the next chapter. Thus the inadequacy of the Law and the sufficiency of the Gospel become evident. On the theory

the law of God, but with the flesh	λέγω νόμῳ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ
the law of sin.	νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας.

that the Apostle is describing the conflict of nature with grace in the Christian mind, it will be difficult to discover the direct bearing of this description on his general course of thought and argument.

The latter half of the 25th verse is by no means clear. It is not easy to determine whether *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* be best rendered, *I myself* or *I the same person*. In either case, however, the general sense is most probably the same, as the former cannot without harshness be referred to any other than the speaker who had been lamenting his weakness and had just expressed his thankfulness. The person affirms that "with his mind he serves the law of God, but with his flesh the law of sin." This language does certainly bear a strong similarity to that before used in vs. 16–23, and therefore many expositors regard it as a repetition of the description there made. Thus, to consent to, to delight in or be pleased with, and to serve the law of God, are supposed to express the same thought, namely, the harmony of reason and conscience in the awakened mind with that law. But, inasmuch as it is difficult to see why the Apostle should revert to the man's former condition after he had made him exult in the Gospel through Christ, these expositors have resorted to various expedients in order to remove or at least to lessen this difficulty.

Macknight reads the clause interrogatively, thus making the latter part of it equivalent to a negation, and to present his view the more clearly, he subjoins to the interrogation the words, "by no means." But if the Apostle intended thus to declare the Christian's state of liberation, he has done so with an obscurity of manner not at all in character with the plainness of his ordinary interrogative appeals, which his intelligent readers can hardly misunderstand. Comp. ver. 24 and viii. 31–35. Besides, the use of the phrase "serve the law of God" to denote nothing more than the full acquiescence of the mind as under the influence of reason and conscience, is harsh. To serve is to obey, to do the commands of, and will not bear such a very modified signification.

The last remark is also an objection to Stuart's interpretation, which makes the clause "a summary of the whole preceding representation." He places the former half of the verse which contains the thanksgiving in a parenthesis, and says, "to parenthesis it clearly belongs, inasmuch as it breaks in altogether upon the thread of discussion, and is simply an anticipation of what is about to follow." But I apprehend that very few readers will approve of such a view as this. The lamentable cry for help is so triumphantly overpowered by the thanksgiving for experienced deliverance, that the natural feeling would seem to be absorbed in the pseudo-critical, before such a supposition can be adopted.

VIII. Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα *There is therefore now no con-* VIII.
τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ μὴ κατὰ *demnation to them which are in*

If the meaning of the expression, "I serve the law of God" would allow it, I would propose to place the latter half of this verse in contradistinction to the first verse of the next chapter, and to regard the one clause as retrospective, introducing again the former description, and the other as prospective, stating the true Christian's condition in consequence of his acceptance of the Gospel. But the proper meaning of the verb *to serve* is stronger than in this case it could bear. Besides, the particle *οὐν*, *then*, seems most naturally to be connected with what immediately precedes. I do not feel at liberty, therefore, to adopt this arrangement.

Apart from any particular examination of the clause in question, it would seem most reasonable to suppose that, after the Apostle had brought the description of his personified character to the point of expressing grateful emotions for deliverance, he would immediately proceed to delineate the same person's Christian condition. If therefore what follows is susceptible of such an exposition, its correctness would seem to be highly probable. Such an interpretation may certainly be given, provided we regard the *serving* of the law of God as emphatic or make that the prominent thought. It is certain that, in the former description, no such assertion had been made of the awakened but as yet not Christianized mind. The most that had been said amounts merely to acquiescence in and satisfaction with God's law. And moreover, the serving of it, that is, the doing its requirements, is the very thing which the man had repeatedly said he neither did nor could do. 'To wish is present with me, but to perform the good—not.' As Olshausen well remarks, in the former state "the whole man, the mind included, was unable to serve the law of God; but here the mind, (now) the ruling principle in the whole man, appears as freed, and in this freedom serving the law of God, and only the lower sphere of life remains subjected to the law of sin." The result therefore seems to be this, that the mind in its now Christian condition has, by the grace of Christ, become enabled to render a holy obedience to God's law; though in his carnal and sinful nature the man is still subjected to its tendencies.

viii. 1. "Therefore," *ἄρα* the same word occurs in the preceding clause with *οὐν*, here we have *νῦν* now, which marks more distinctly the man's Christian condition.—"In Christ Jesus:" This phrase expresses the true Christian's intimate union with Christ, and is of frequent occurrence. It is taken probably from our Lord's comparison of himself to a vine and his disciples to its living branches, and his expressions of their connection with him which spring from the same figure. See John xv. 1, 2, 4-7, xvii. 21, 23, 26. This connection is not simply outward by becoming members ostensibly of his church, but inward also by partaking of his nature and

Christ Jesus, who walk not after	σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν. Ὁ γὰρ	2
2 the flesh, but after the Spirit. For	νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς	
the law of the Spirit of life in	ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἡλευθέρωσέ	
Christ Jesus hath made me free	με ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας	

character. Having been baptized into Christ both externally and internally, we become thereby members not only of his visible but also of his mystical body. On the ground of such union, Christ is said to be in us and we are said to be in and of Christ, parts even of his very self. See 2 Cor. xiii. 5, Col. i. 27, Phil. iii. 9, 1 Cor. xv. 23, Gal. v. 24, Eph. v. 30. Such cannot be in danger of condemnation. The remainder of the verse is probably not genuine. It is wanting in many of the best ancient authorities, and was perhaps at first a marginal gloss taken from ver. 4. As other weighty authorities retain all except the last three words, Hahn has adopted this reading. The language describes the course of those who are in Christ Jesus.

2. The Apostle now resumes the personification which he had so largely employed in the preceding chapter, limiting it however to this verse. Perhaps he introduces it in order to make the contrast of the declaration with that of vii. 23 the more striking. In the one case the tyrannical law spoken of conquers and takes captive the man, who, in the other, is liberated by the Gospel.—“The law of the Spirit of life:” This may be what the Rhetoricians call an *asyndeton*, that is, an expression in which the copulative is wanting. If so, *and* must be inserted after Spirit. Or the phrase may be equivalent to life-giving Spirit. The whole clause may denote the Gospel as a spiritual and life-communicating system, as the word *law* is often used. See iii. 27, James i. 25, Mic. iv. 2, Isa. ii. 3, xlii. 4. In this sense it is taken by Ammon the annotator on Koppe. “The law of sin and death” he considers as the same law spoken of in the former chapter as becoming the occasion of sin and thus condemning to or producing death. But, although this view would keep up an antithesis between the two parts of the verse, and would harmonize also with the meaning of law in ver. 3, the evident opposition between this place and vii. 23, forbids its adoption. It is better therefore to regard the phrase as denoting the religious principle of divine life implanted by the Holy Spirit which is efficacious to deliver from the state of thralldom produced by the sinful and deadly “law of the members” before mentioned. According to this latter view also, the two laws stand in direct contradistinction to each other, the one as the carnal controlling impetus of fallen humanity, and the other as the spiritual element which influences and grows in the regenerated mind.

3, 4. Τὸ ἀδύνατον is like τὸ γνωστόν in i. 19. It may be the accusative absolute, and translated thus: ‘as to what the law could not do.’ Or it may be regarded as in apposition with the concluding statements of the verse, and also with their result as expressed in the next; and then what the

<p>3 καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύ- νατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ θεός, τὸν ἐαν- τοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρ-</p>	<p>from the law of sin and death. For 3 what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, con-</p>
--	---

Christian scheme is said to do will be represented in the outset as something entirely beyond the capability of the law. Its weakness is ascribed to "the flesh." This does not mean on account of the imperfection of the law as a system chiefly external, "carnal," as the adjective is used in Heb. vii. 16; for the Apostle is not speaking of the Mosaic law as such, but of the moral law which had been the topic of the preceding part of the section. The cause of its inadequacy lies in human weakness and sinfulness. See vii. 12-14, Heb. vii. 18, Gal. iii. 21, 22, Acts xiii. 39.—"Sending his own son:" This affirms the sonship of the messenger before he was sent, which is also most strikingly represented in John iii. 16.—"Likeness of sinful flesh:" *Flesh* here, as often elsewhere, is used for the whole man. See John i. 14, and Isa. xl. 5. The Apostle does not say in "sinful flesh," but in its likeness. Thus he guards against the error of attaching sinfulness to Christ's nature. Comp. Heb. iv. 15. The introduction of sin through Adam vitiated but did not destroy the nature in which he had been "made upright," Eccles. vii. 29, and this original human nature was assumed by Christ.—"And for sin:" This may simply mean 'on account of sin,' like the dative in vi. 10; or, it may convey the idea of atonement for sin, προσφορά or θῦμα or θυσία being understood. See Heb. x. 8, where the same ellipsis occurs, "burnt offerings and περὶ ἁμαρτίας," and in the Septuagint, "the priest shall offer τὸ περὶ ἁμαρτίας first, and shall sprinkle of the blood τοῦ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας." Levit. v. 8, 9. So also in vi. 30, vii. 7, 37, xiv. 19.—"Condemned:" The verb is declarative and equivalent to, 'showed his condemnation of.' This was done by subjecting Christ to suffering on account of human sin whereby it was atoned for. The close connection in which this stands with the former phrase favours the meaning just given to it.—"In the flesh:" Some explain this of Christ's flesh, and consider the phrase as parallel to that in 1 Pet. ii. 24, "in his own body." Others, with whom I should concur, prefer the meaning in which it is generally employed before, namely *carnal nature*. Thus it will be closely connected with *sin*.

The author has pointed out one thing effected by Christ which the law was incompetent to do, that is, making satisfaction for sin by an atonement. He now proceeds to another: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit:" This implies grace procured by the atonement and imparted to the believer, by which he is enabled to live a holy life; all which lies entirely beyond the

- 4 demned sin in the flesh ; that the
 righteousness of the law might be
 fulfilled in us, who walk not after
 5 the flesh, but after the Spirit. For
 they that are after the flesh do
 mind the things of the flesh ; but
 they that are after the Spirit, the
 6 things of the Spirit. For to be
 carnally minded is death, but to be
 spiritually minded is life and peace :
 7 because the carnal mind is enmity
 against God ; for it is not subject to
 the law of God, neither indeed can
 8 be. So then they that are in the
- τίας, κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν
 ἐν τῇ σαρκί, ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ 4
 νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν, τοῖς μὴ
 κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ
 κατὰ πνεῦμα. Οἱ γὰρ κατὰ 5
 σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρο-
 νοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα τὰ
 τοῦ πνεύματος. Τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα 6
 τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος, τὸ δὲ φρόν-
 ημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰ-
 ρήνη. Διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς 7
 σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν· τῷ γὰρ
 νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται,
 οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται. Οἱ δὲ ἐν 8

province of the law. "The righteousness of the law," is its holy requisitions. Thus the phrase is used in ii. 26, only the word is in the plural. Here the singular is used, but evidently in a complex sense, as it is also in v. 18.—"Fulfilled:" Better, 'fully done.' The verb πληρόω often takes its meaning from the context, and expresses a good measure of the subject concerning which it is predicated. Thus in Matt. iii. 15: '*fully* to comply with all religious obligations;' Acts xii. 25, '*fully performed* their ministry;' Rom. xiii. 8, '*fully* obeyed the law.' Of course St. Paul does not speak of an absolutely perfect, but an honourable and sincere obedience, showing that "the law of the mind" predominates over that "of the flesh." Thus in James ii. 8: "if ye *fulfil*," *fully* do, "the royal law," where the Greek word τελεῖτε is quite as strong as that here used.—"In us:" He says *in* rather than *by*, probably to call attention to the all-important fact, that this righteousness is produced in the regenerate by the efficient aid of the Spirit; and perhaps also in reference to the language used of sin as an agent in vii. 17, 20.—What follows is added to describe the Christian character. The meaning is: who do not live according to the promptings of the sinful principle in fallen nature, but are swayed by the new and holy principle which has been implanted by God's Spirit. The words "flesh" and "spirit" are employed in the same sense in John iii. 6: "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." As the spiritual element in the regenerate is the production of the Holy Spirit, the same word is used both for the agent and his work. Thus the term *light* denotes both Christ himself and also the blessings of his Gospel. See John i. 4, 5, 7–9.

5–8. "Do mind:" That is, 'are bent upon.' Thus the word is used in Matt. xvi. 23, and rendered in our translation "savourest." It expresses general character. Comp. Phil. iii. 15, 16, 19, Col. iii. 2. So also the noun φρόνημα. If understood actively, it will express the minding, the being

9 *σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῶ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύ-
 νανται. Ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν
 σαρκί, ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ
 πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν· εἰ
 δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει,
 10 οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. Εἰ δὲ
 Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα
 νεκρὸν δι' ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦ-
 11 μα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην. Εἰ δὲ
 τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος Ἰησοῦν
 ἐκ νεκρῶν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγεί-
 ρας τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωο-*

flesh cannot please God. But ye 9
 are not in the flesh, but in the
 Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of
 God dwell in you. Now if any
 man have not the Spirit of Christ,
 he is none of his. And if Christ, 10
 be in you, the body is dead because
 of sin; but the spirit is life because
 of righteousness. But if the Spirit 11
 of him that raised up Jesus from
 the dead dwell in you, he that
 raised up Christ from the dead shall

bent upon and governed by; if passively, the principle, the sinful character from which such a condition springs. The latter is to be preferred. Compare the word in ver. 27, where it denotes the mind or will of the Spirit. The Greek phrase in the text is thus employed in our 9th Article to denote the sinful element of nature as remaining in the regenerate.—Death on the one hand and life and peace on the other, are the respective results produced by the influence of the two principles. In ver. 7, the carnal principle is described as inimical to God; and this hostility is immediately stated to consist in opposition to his law. It neither is nor can be subject thereto, because both are contrary in their very nature. Such subjection therefore can only exist where a new principle has been introduced within the man. Hence the meaning and truth of the remark, that “they who are in the flesh cannot please God,” are self-evident. For the meaning of “in the flesh,” see on vii. 5, p. 107.

9-11. As the phrase “in the Spirit” is antithetic to that “in the flesh,” its meaning must be, ‘in a holy state, under the influence of the Spirit.’ Comp. ix. 1, 1 Cor. xii. 3. And such is necessarily the result of the condition annexed, “if the Spirit of God dwell in you.” These words describe habitual influence, and imply close association. See Exod. xxix. 45, 2 Cor. vi. 16, and especially John xiv. 23, “we will *make our abode* with him.” The Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ, as whose messenger and agent he is sent. Comp. John xiv. 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7, 14, 15. The *general* meaning is identical with that of the word “Christ” in the next verse. The first two phrases may be equivalent to ‘a Godly or Christlike mind,’ and express religious and spiritual character, and the same mind may afterwards be personified and spoken of as Christ himself. But it is preferable to consider the Holy Spirit and Christ both to be personally intended, and their intimate union with the believer to be implied. Middleton admits the Holy Spirit to be meant in ver. 11, but not in ver. 9, where he maintains the other sense of “a Godly and Christian frame of mind,” referring to texts

also quicken your mortal bodies by ποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα
his Spirit that dwelleth in you. ὑμῶν διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ
 πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν.

where the word *spirit* is used to mark the temper and disposition.* But the words, “dwell in you,” which are added in each case, favour an identity of meaning, and I presume that nothing but the absence of the article in the former would have led him to explain them differently.

“The body indeed is dead because of sin:” This is the correct translation. Some have endeavoured to support another of the last words, ‘with respect to sin;’ but this is neither sanctioned by usage nor in accordance with the context. In this case the body is supposed to mean natural corruption, as probably it does in vi. 6, vii. 24, and below ver. 13; and this is said to be dead, that is, comparatively, because its power is broken and abated. But in opposition to this view it is quite sufficient to say, that the connection of the two verses shows “the dead body” of the one to be the same as the “mortal bodies” of the other. Now it would be preposterous to explain the latter of the element of natural corruption, both on account of the plural number, and because this is never represented as made vigorous and living through the Gospel, but always, on the contrary, as something which must be crucified, put to death, and abolished. The term “body” therefore must be taken in its literal meaning. It is said to be “dead:” Perhaps because this is soon to be its condition; perhaps also because its true, ultimate, and future glorified life is not yet operative. Thus in vii. 8, sin is called “dead,” meaning comparatively inefficient. “Spirit,” being used in contradistinction to “body,” means *soul*; and this is said to be “life,” in other words *fully alive with*. We have the same figure in Ps. xlv. 8, “all thy garments (are) myrrh, and aloes, and cassia,” that is, they are thoroughly impregnated with the scent of such odoriferous herbs.—“On account of righteousness.” Justification cannot be the true meaning here, for this would not preserve the antithesis with sin in the former clause; religiousness of character, holiness of the inner man, is the Apostle’s idea.—“Him that raised up Jesus from the dead:” This and the similar clause that follows are periphrases for God, yet intended to impress the thought of Christ’s resurrection by divine power, introductory to the thought of the same power being exerted in our resurrection. Comp. on iv. 24.—“By his Spirit that dwelleth in you:” This accords with the common Greek reading, which has the preposition *διὰ* with the genitive. But the marginal reading is greatly to be preferred: “because of his Spirit.” This is also the translation of Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva and Rheims versions, and the meaning of Wiclif’s also, which employs the

* The Doctrine of the Greek article applied to the criticism and illustration of the New Testament. New York, 1813, p. 246.

- 12 Ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ὀφειλέται Therefore, brethren, we are 12
 ἐσμὲν οὐ τῇ σαρκί, τοῦ κατὰ debtors, not to the flesh, to live
 13 σάρκα ζῆν. Εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα after the flesh. For if ye live after 13
 ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν· εἰ the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye
 δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώ- through the Spirit do mortify the

word “for.” The best external authorities have the accusative, and thus sustain this reading and signification, which are also strongly corroborated by the internal evidence. The remark of Professor Stuart, that the “agent had been already named, he who raised up Christ,” is not of much force, for *God* might be said to raise us up *by means of his Spirit*. But it is not the Apostle’s intention to refer to the Spirit as the agent in effecting the Christian’s glorious resurrection, only as the given pledge of it. The accusative reading expresses this sense, *on account of*. This is confirmed by the same use of the preposition in ver. 10, *on account of* sin, *on account of* righteousness, and also by the language in 2 Cor. v. 5, where “the Spirit” is said to be “given unto us” as “the earnest” of our resurrection. Comp. John. vi. 39, 40, 44, 54, where the promise of future resurrection is made to those who belong to Christ, who believe in him through the Father’s drawing, who are incorporated in him by a living union. All these phrases imply one and the same thing, as do the indwelling of the Spirit and that of Christ before explained. Thus, in the correct language of the commentator just named, “the last clause assigns a reason why he who raised up Jesus from the dead will quicken his true followers, because he has given them his Spirit.”—The whole statement then is to this effect: ‘If Christ be in you by a spiritual and vital union, although the body indeed in its present condition is spiritually feeble and must soon become literally dead, yet the soul already abounds with a holy happiness on account of that religious character which has been wrought in it. And if the Spirit of God habitually influences and governs you, God, who raised Jesus Christ from the dead, will give life even to those frail, weak and mortal bodies of yours, on account of his Spirit whom he hath caused to abide with you and to penetrate into your inmost being.’

12–14. The conclusion drawn in ver. 12, which expresses the Christian’s obligation not to live according to the promptings of natural sinfulness, is followed in the 13th by a statement of the consequences of sinful or holy living. These are death and life, that is, misery and happiness. Olshausen, regarding this exposition of the terms as “altogether too feeble,” views them as relating to the glorification of the body or the forfeiture of this blessing. But while in their full application they certainly comprehend these, no reason can be assigned for making this the principal thought. His reference to John vi. 50, to show that *not dying* is equivalent to *being raised at the last day*, is not satisfactory, as that glorious resurrection is not iden-

- deeds of the body, ye shall live. *μάτος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε.* "Οσοι 14
 14 For as many as are led by the Spirit *γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗ-*
 of God, they are the Sons of God. *τοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ θεοῦ. Οὐ γὰρ* 15
 15 For ye have not received the spirit *ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν*
 of bondage again to fear; but ye *εἰς φόβον, ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα*
 have received the Spirit of adoption,

tical with *living*, but introductory to a condition in which the life is to be enjoyed.—“Through the Spirit:” *Πνεύματι* may be translated ‘in the spirit,’ and explained of the Christian’s *spiritual state* in opposition to a former carnal one; or, ‘by the spirit,’ meaning by the influence of the *spiritual character* implanted in him. But it is better to retain the usual exposition, the Holy Spirit, as he is *the agent by* whom alone we are enabled to live conformably to our obligations, and as in the next verse he is spoken of as the leader of God’s children.—“The deeds of the body:” *Body* is undoubtedly the true reading, although several important authorities have *flesh*, *τῆς σαρκός*. This shows, however, in what sense their authors understood the word *body*. For its meaning in such a connection, see vi. 6, and vii. 24, with the notes. In Col. ii. 11, it occurs in the same sense.—“The deeds:” This word preserves the figure. The aggregate of sin being represented as a body and also personified, individual sins, which are sometimes depicted as its members, (see Col. iii. 5,) may naturally be considered as its acts; and here these are substituted by a metonymy for the feelings and passions whence they spring. In Col. iii. 9, the same word occurs in the sense of sinful actions and motions: “ye have put off the old man with his *deeds*.” The whole phrase, therefore, is equivalent to such an opposition to sinful passions as tends to their final destruction.

15–17. “Again” should be connected with “fear,” not with “received.” —“Spirit of bondage—spirit of adoption:” These phrases may be pleonastic, and express simply what is denoted by the latter words. But, as their use seems to have been suggested by the term Spirit before employed, the meaning is probably as follows: ‘the Spirit whom you have received is not one which brings you again into a condition of fearful apprehension, but which effects your adoption into God’s family.’ Thus in 1 Cor. ii. 12, the spirit whom the Apostle claims to have received is said to be “not of the world but of God.” In Isa. xi. 2, we read of “the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord,” meaning the efficient power which enables its possessor to exercise what is expressed by the words, which power is imparted by this Spirit.—“Bondage” is not to be limited to subjection to the law; it comprehends also the slavery of sin.—The “adoption” is that state of sonship which is the Christian’s privilege here preparatory to complete adoption attendant on the resurrection: See ver. 23.—The thought in the lat-

<p> <i>υιοθεσίας, ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· ἀββᾶ,</i> 16 <i>ὁ πατήρ. Αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμ-</i> <i>μαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν, ὅτι</i> 17 <i>ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ. Εἰ δὲ τέκνα,</i> <i>καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν</i> <i>θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ·</i> </p>	<p> whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness 16 with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, 17 then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we </p>
---	--

ter part of the verse is simply this: ‘by the influence of whom we recognise God as our affectionate father.’ The relation is expressed not only in Greek, but in the Chaldee form also; perhaps because this approximates more nearly to infantile enunciation, and thus is intimated that child-like feeling of love and docility which accompanies the recognition. The same use of both languages occurs also in the parallel place, Gal. iv. 6, and in our Lord’s prayer in the garden, Mark xiv. 36. Here the language of recognition is put in the mouth of the Christian: “*we cry.*” In Galatians the same act is attributed to the divine agent: “God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, *crying*, Abba, Father.” This is readily explained on the principle, *qui facit per alium facit per se*, as it is only through the influence of the Holy Spirit that the child of God is brought to recognise with joyous trust his heavenly father. The emotion is, in the one place, ascribed to the Spirit, and in the other, to Christians themselves. And thus, in ver. 26, the ‘inward intercessions of the Christian are attributed to the Spirit, inasmuch as they are produced by his operation.’ The same usage occurs also in relation to cases of demoniacal agency, the language said to be uttered being ascribed indifferently to the demon and to the possessed. Compare the narratives of the cure of the two demoniacs of Gadara in Matt. viii. 28 et seq., Mark v. 1 et seq., and Luke viii. 26 et seq.

The attestation of the Spirit here spoken of is made to the mind of the believer, and is therefore internal, as it is said in 1 John v. 10, he “hath the witness *in himself.*” It consists *chiefly* in the Christian character, but as this is the work of the Spirit, it is he who testifies. This is proved more clearly by the parallel place in Galatians before quoted, where God is said to have *sent forth* the Spirit into the heart, implying the mission of a personal agent. The witness consists in satisfying the individual of his filial relation to God, inasmuch as he has become conscious of holy affections, and sincere endeavours to “live righteously, soberly, and godly.” This religious condition of the soul is accompanied by spiritual comfort in trouble, and by habitual, though it may not be invariable, hope and trust in future blessedness. A *feeling* of acceptance, amounting even to assurance, is happily not the test of filiation laid down in Scripture; for such a test must ever be uncertain, and often dependent on physical condition and natural temperament.—It is better to give the preposition its proper force, as is done in our authorised version, and also in the Genevan, which has “together

suffer with *him*, that we may be also glorified together. *ἐῖπερ συμπάσχομεν, ἵνα καὶ συν-δοξασθῶμεν.*

with." Wiclif and the Rheims translate "to;" and this is the sense of Tyndale, and Cranmer, "certifieth oure sprete." The Apostle's meaning is, that the thoughts and reflections and reasonings, in a word, the operations of the mind on itself, act on and thus join along with its regenerated and renewed character in attesting a state of sonship. It is true that this view does not necessarily follow from the use of the preposition in composition; still, it agrees best with St. Paul's manner, and with the three compound words in the next verse. Heirship along with Christ results from filiation, as glorification does from the true Christian's "fellowship" with his master's "sufferings." See Phil. iii. 10.

SECTION X.

CHAP. VIII. 18-39.

THE TRIALS OF LIFE AND THE BLESSINGS OF THE GOSPEL BOTH HERE AND
HEREAFTER COMPARED. GOD'S PURPOSE TO CONFER ALL THESE BLESSINGS
ON HIS REDEEMED. CONSEQUENT EXULTATION AND TRIUMPH.

18 For I reckon that the sufferings *Λογίζομαι γάρ, ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια* 18

VERSES 18, 19. In addition to the well known English commentators, the reader is referred on these and some of the following verses to a dissertation by Doederlein, in the *Commentationes Theologicæ*, vol. I. pp. 483 et seq., and another by Danhauwer, in the *Thesaurus Theologico-Philologicus*, appended to the *Critici Sacri*, Amstel. 1702, pp. 503 et seq. Also, to Stuart's 8th Excursus in his *Commentary*, or his article on the passage in the *Biblical Repository* for April 1831, vol. I. pp. 363-406. The *Commentaries* of Tholuck and Olshausen contain farther references to German writers, and also important original remarks.

"For:" This shows the connection with what immediately precedes. Having mentioned suffering and glorification along with Christ, the Apostle here presents the Christian with the strongest motive to bear such suffering with resignation and cheerfulness, in consequence of the infinitely superior blessings which the glory that is to follow comprehends.—"I reckon:" I consider. The word implies the result of a careful comparison of present evils with future blessings.—"Worthy to be compared:" *ἄξια* that is, equivalent to, sufficient to counterbalance.—"The glory about to be revealed"

τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ of this present time *are* not worthy

is evidently what in the next verse is implied in the “manifestation,” or, as it ought to have been rendered, *the revelation* “of the sons of God.” The noun ἀποκάλυψιν plainly refers back to the verb ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, a reference which is lost sight of in our English translation in consequence of not employing the same word in both places. This is done by Wiclif and the Rheims version, the former using *shew* and the latter *reveal*.—The term “glory” is sometimes used in reference to the present blessings of Christ’s kingdom. Thus in 2 Cor. iii. 7–11, the Gospel and its ministry are said to be “glorious,” and the Hebrew word for *glorify* or *honour* occurs in Isa. ix. 1, (Heb. viii. 23,) where, instead of our English translation, “did more grievously afflict,” the true meaning is *glorified* or *honoured*. See on the text Dr. and Bishop Lowth, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Alexander, and others. It is used also of its future blessings. Thus in 2 Cor. iv. 17, “weight of glory,” and in Col. iii. 4, “appear with him in glory.” But, employed in a more general sense, it comprehends both these meanings, denoting the present and the future blessings of Christ’s kingdom. Indeed, like the phrase “kingdom of heaven,” these two meanings are merely subdivisions of the primitive more general signification. In 1 Cor. ii. 10, it undoubtedly refers to these blessings as *revealed to the Apostles*; and yet the previous verses and the original passage in Isaiah lxiv. 4, show that the word comprehends vastly more than had been or indeed could now be revealed, even the fullness of heavenly blessings. In the passage under consideration there is no reason for limiting the meaning. Both the present and future blessings of Christ’s kingdom are here to be taken in connection, as constituting one whole. The future part, however, is to be regarded as incomparably the greatest, both in the nature and degree of its enjoyments, and also on account of their being eternal. It is on the ground of this union of the present and the future, that the called, the justified, in ver. 30, are also the glorified. Their glorification hath already begun. In harmony with this view, “the believer on the Son” is said to “have” already “everlasting life:” John iii. 36. With the spirit and general tenor of the verse, compare 1 Pet. iv. 13.—It is uncertain whether εἰς is better rendered *in* or *to* us. Either is allowable, and either makes a good sense. The revelation of the glory is partly to the soul and therefore *in* us; and partly also to be understood and appreciated by others, and thus in a degree *to* us. The former view, however, coincides best with the Apostle’s general tone of feeling and description, and with the character of the glorified condition, which is chiefly internal.

The revelation of the sons of God is not the manifesting of them to the universe. As the phrase must be explained by the previous verse, it can mean nothing else than the glorious condition which is to be made known

to be compared with the glory πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀπο-

to them by their own blessed experience; and this is what the creature is said to expect with extraordinary earnestness. Ἀποκαταδοκία is an emphatic word, and etymologically expresses the idea of expecting with head erect or bent forward. In forming a view of the Apostle's train of thought, it is important to ascertain, if possible, the application of the word translated "creature," ἡ κτίσις, which may signify either the act of creating or the thing created.

A vast variety of meanings has been devised by extravagant criticism and mental ingenuity. These I shall omit, and mention three only, each of which has been defended by men of good sense and sound philological learning.

1. Several commentators of distinction consider the word as expressing a moral creation, and understand by it Christians converted either from Judaism or Heathenism or both. The term "creature," κτίσις, and "workmanship," ποίημα, which is analogous to it, are certainly used to denote true Christians. The latter occurs with this application in Eph. ii. 10, and the former in texts which will be quoted immediately. This usage arises out of the fact, that the Christian is another being than he was before his conversion, and has become so by the creative power of God operating within him. Thus St. Paul says with striking beauty and force, "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ:" 2 Cor. iv. 6. The word therefore fitly expresses the Christian condition. But, whenever it is thus used in the New Testament, it is accompanied by certain adjuncts which determine this to be its meaning. Thus, in Eph. iv. 24, the Christian character is said to be "created in righteousness and true holiness." In 2 Cor. v. 17, the convert is called "a new creature," and the same phrase occurs in Gal. vi. 15, to express the state of the Christian. Besides, in vs. 22, 23, those who had "received the first fruits of the Spirit" are contrasted with "the whole creation, the creature" of ver. 19. But it is wholly unreasonable to suppose that the former can be limited to Jewish converts, as it would be, if the contrasted phrase stood for Heathen converts; or that it can be intended of the Apostles themselves, as is supposed by those who explain that phrase of converts in general. No such limitation is admissible, for what is said is true of all sincere Christians. The conclusion is evident, that "creature" cannot be intended to denote Christians either in whole or in part.

2. Another class of expositors understand the word "creature" here and in ver. 22, in its general meaning of 'all creation.' Thus the Apostle expresses his idea of future glorification by means of a beautiful and even magnificent personification of all created nature longing after such a con-

19 καλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. Ἡ γὰρ which shall be revealed in us.

summation. In defining this view more accurately, some take into consideration this world in its present condition, understanding the irrational in opposition to the rational creation; while others grasp in imagination the universe, without, however, expressing themselves fully or clearly as to all the particulars comprehended therein. Tholuck adopts the former modification. Olshausen maintains the latter view. He says: "The Apostle extends his look over the *whole creation*;—he spans with one mighty glance the *whole creation* in all its parts.—By the *creature*, not merely our earth or our solar system, but the totality of all creation, heaven and earth, the material and spiritual world, must be understood." And yet the phenomena by which he attempts to illustrate his view are all taken from terrestrial nature, the birth of animals, the bursting and growth of plants, and what he represents as their struggles towards an unattainable perfection. I may remark, by the way, that among these intended illustrations there is not one in which the supposed struggle of nature results in any superiority over the parent plant or animal. They are therefore rather efforts after preservation and continuance than improvement and ultimate perfection, and consequently do not bear on the point to be illustrated. Indeed I am constrained to say, that imagination and poetic feeling seem here to have had more influence on this devout and thoughtful commentator, than calm reasoning or well settled facts. Doubtless the introduction of sin into the world by man, did produce a change in the inferior parts of earthly creation, substituting thorns and thistles for fragrant flowers and fruitful plants, disturbing the harmony even in material, and most probably much more in irrational nature. And therefore a state of blessedness which shall entirely counteract the effects of the fall, may well be described as embracing a change even in irrational nature. This would be equivalent to declaring that the original perfection, which characterised God's work, when he surveyed the immense whole and pronounced it all to be "very good," shall be restored. In other words, all the evil of sin shall be abundantly repaired. A poetic mind may well be conceived to pour out this thought in language which represents all nature as wailing at its present degradation, and anxiously and with bitter throes labouring in the hope of a glorious birth and youthful immortality. And thus in the sublime language of the prophets, the mountains and the forests burst forth in exulting strains, and the hoary deep lifts up his voice on high, and surges out the praises of God.* This may be the Apostle's general thought, as it is also the prophets', when they describe the peaceful, loving character of Messiah's reign.† But the nature of the figure and of the truth to be illus-

* See Isa. xlv. 23, lv. 12. Ps. xevi. 11, 12, and other similar places.

† Ps. lxxii. 3, 6, 16, Isa. xi. 6-9, lv. 12, 13, lx. lxv. 17-25.

19 For the earnest expectation of the ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τῆν

trated forbids us to make all the details of the imagery real. We must not infer a radical change of material nature; we must not expect the noxious beast or reptile to be transformed into the bland and gentle companion, or the discords of the present sublunary creation to become attuned to the harmony of divine love. By attempting to carry the figure to extremes we counteract its rightful illustrative element. This has been done by the Rabbies, whose exhibitions of the renovation which is to mark the Messiah's kingdom, are characterised by puerility and extravagance. They may be found in some of the writers above referred to. I will only add that, allowing the very early Jews to have cherished the expectation that the earth was to be restored to its paradisaical state, this will not prove that St. Paul or any other sacred writer intended to convey the same impression by the use of general language like that of the text. The most that can properly be inferred from it is this, that in the end Christ shall completely counteract the ruinous effects of sin which has degraded God's originally beautiful and harmonious creation, and establish universal righteousness, holiness, and happiness in all the wide domains of his glorified kingdom. Whether this kingdom shall embrace within its borders regenerated material and irrational nature, is a useless speculation, about which men may indulge their imaginations at the expense of sober and religious thought, and which has been and may again become the fruitful source of unbounded and mischievous corporeal indulgence. See, for one illustration, the extravagant traditional statements of Papias in Irenæus ad Hær. Lib. v. Cap. 33, pp. 454, 455, Edit. Grabe, Ox. 1702.

3. Another view of the word κτίσις, *creature*, is defended by some of the most judicious commentators, and conveys most probably the Apostle's leading thought. It may be used for mankind generally, the popular use of language allowing that to be affirmed of all, which is applicable to a large proportion. Thus in John x. 8, "*all that ever* came before me are thieves and robbers," is probably to be understood with considerable limitation. This is undoubtedly the case in John xii. 19, "*the world* has gone after him," and in John iii. 26, "*all* come to him." Multitudes of other instances might easily be added. That the word translated *creature* is used to express mankind seems certain from Mark xvi. 15 and Col. i. 23, "preach the Gospel to every *creature*—the Gospel, which was preached to every *creature* which is under heaven." Olshausen's attempt to give these texts another meaning is a failure. He denies that the word is ever used in the New Testament to "signify men only. In the former" of the texts just cited, "*creature* is mankind only so far as it is regarded as the flower of the creation in general, as appears from the use of *every* along with it;" (the reason given is an unfounded assertion :) "in the latter, *creature* is taken locally

ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ creature waiteth for the manifesta-

of the extent of earth, equal to *world*." The exposition is arbitrary and forced. How could he speak of man as "the flower of a creation" which he had before represented as "totality," comprehending "the spiritual and material world?" and where will he find any place in the Old or New Testament where the word refers to "local extent of earth?" These expositions afford a striking illustration of the influence of theory on the mind of an able interpreter. In addition to the proof contained in the texts above quoted that mankind in general is a legitimate meaning of the original term, I may add that the Rabbies sometimes apply the Hebrew word for creation or creature in the same limited way to mankind, particularly the Heathen. See the writers before referred to, and also Lightfoot on Mark xvi. 15, who gives several apposite quotations from the Talmud and other Jewish authorities, and applies their meaning to this passage in Romans. According to this view of the words, while the Apostle's language may comprehend a figurative and poetic personification of all terrestrial creation as longing for deliverance from present imperfection and degradation, yet this earnest expectation will be predicated chiefly of mankind in general, anxiously desiring an amelioration of their condition, which was expected in various degrees of excellence and with different degrees of hope and trust, according to circumstances.

To this view several objections have been urged. First, it is said "that all men cannot be meant, since the regenerate as such, ver. 19, are expressly excepted." This objection is urged by Olshausen, who nevertheless takes the phrase in its most unlimited meaning, which of course comprehends all men. But I have already shown that such language often expresses what is common, though very far from being universal. The regenerate, although a part of mankind in its totality, is no part of that whole creation with which they are contrasted; just as in 1 John v. 19, "we," meaning true Christians, are set in opposition to "the *whole world* lying in wickedness;" and in Num. xvi. 29, the rebel faction of Korah, Dathan and Abiram are contrasted with "*all men*." Secondly it is questioned whether St. Paul would have represented such a feeling and wish on the part of Heathen men as a "longing after Christian glorification, considering how much the feeling was destitute of a moral basis." Such a "thought would have been expressed quite differently from the tone of this passage." No doubt the moral ground of the expressed desire was, in multitudes who felt something of it, very weak. I see no good reason, however, for assuming that the Apostle's statement requires any other supposition. Admitting this moral weakness, the desire for a better condition may nevertheless have been exceedingly strong. The thought is expressed in language prompted by the Apostle's own views and feelings,

20 tion of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in

ἀπεκδέχεται. Τῇ γὰρ ματαιό- 20
τητι ἢ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦ-
σα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα,

and therefore, in its application to the Heathen, it must not be rigorously pressed. Compare the language occasionally in Chap. vii. What "Christian glorification" properly is, doubtless they did not know. But the objection proves too much. For even the true Christian's knowledge on this point is also very imperfect. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be," says the most honoured and spiritual of the Lord's "friends," (1 John iii. 2;) and so all but infinitely transcendent may be the future state of glorification, that between the Heathen's infrequent, uncertain and momentary glimpse, and the Christian's present knowledge, true and well founded in the degree to which it extends, the difference compared with the magnitude of the future "revelation," may be very inconsiderable. And if the objection applies to the meaning now under review, much more does it to that maintained by the objectors, which represents inanimate creation as longing for this "Christian glorification." To attempt to remove this difficulty by calling the Apostle's language a bold personification, is trifling; for by such a figure material nature cannot possibly be represented as longing for what is *properly Christian glorification*. On any view of the place, "the revelation of the sons of God" must be understood in a limited application.

It is well known that the more thoughtful and serious portion of mankind, both before and since the coming of Christ, have often been under the influence of feelings such as those here stated by the Apostle. The reader may find illustrations of this in the writers before referred to and also in other interpreters.

20, 21. "Vanity:" That is, a frail, unhappy, miserable condition. It is applied either to man or to his present circumstances, in Ps. xxxix. 5, Heb., xxxviii. 6, Sept., and Eccles. i. 2, 14.—Here it denotes the transient afflictive, perishing condition introduced through the fall.—"Not willingly." This shows that the word "creature" relates principally to man, as it was quite unnecessary gravely to assert that unconscious and inanimate creation did not willingly acquiesce in this state of things. Dr. Hodge indeed affirms that "this is not true of mankind. It cannot be said, in its full and proper force, that they were brought into their present state not by their own act or 'willingly,' but by the act and power of God." In reply I remark, that the first of these two statements is true, and can therefore be said in its fullest sense; and that the second is not made by the Apostle. The Professor seems to confound the voluntary breach of God's law with the penal consequences that ensued; and therefore he represents the other

21 ἐπ' ἐλπίδι· ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις hope: because the creature itself 21
ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δου- also shall be delivered from the
λείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευ- bondage of corruption into the

view as an "exculpatory declaration not in keeping with the scriptural mode of speaking." But this other view does not regard St. Paul as referring to man's transgression. That was "willingly" committed. But the subjection to vanity that followed, the expulsion from Paradise and all its train of evils, came upon man unwillingly. He was compelled to submit to them. That the second of the above statements is not made by the Apostle will appear from what follows. "By reason, (or, on account) of him who hath subjected:" Some translate; 'by him;' and this the commentator just quoted prefers. The other meaning he allows to be "best suited to the usual force of the preposition with the accusative." Undoubtedly it is, as in such construction it scarcely ever occurs in any other meaning. *By*, he thinks "is to be preferred," because it "gives the better sense." As this is simply a matter of opinion or taste, the superior excellence of the meaning affirmed should always, unless self-evident, be clearly proved. Olshausen regards this sense as worse than feeble. "The observation that God is the originator of this subjection and not man, is something too idle to have any place in this grand development." Both these learned commentators agree in their general exposition of the term creature; but in this point they differ *toto cœlo*. To me the translation "on account of," seems to make the better sense; and therefore, and principally because supported by almost invariable usage, I prefer it to the other. This accords with the older English versions. Wiclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Rheims, have "for;" the Geneva and King James', give the same meaning in the translation "by reason of." They all agree with, and perhaps followed, the Vulgate, *propter*.) The agent who is said to have subjected is the devil, according to Locke, who refers to Gen. iii., Col. ii. 15, and Heb. ii. 14, 15. Others, among whom is James Capel, think Adam to have been meant, and suppose an allusion to the fall and to v. 12 et seq. But the larger proportion of respectable authorities apply the term to God; and this is probably the most natural exposition, and accords best with the context, and also with St. Paul's habit of referring every thing to God. The subjection took place by God, of course, inasmuch, as he induced the state of things implying it, and placed the sinning fallen creature therein; a state too which the culprit would gladly have avoided, had this been within his power. The subjection was compulsory, but *on account* of the divine being who effected it, *in order to* promote his purpose by subjecting man to trial and suffering, thereby leading him to repentance, submission and faith. The sinful creature must be a suffering creature, and this on account of the honour of God, who by a suitable discipline elicits good from evil.

glorious liberty of the children of 22 God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in 23 pain together until now. And not only <i>they</i> , but ourselves also, which	θερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ. Οἶδαμεν γάρ, ὅτι 22 πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ 23 συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν. Οὐ 23 μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν
---	--

“In hope:” Many interpreters and critics of high reputation connect this phrase with the preceding verb *ὑπετάγη*, *made subject*, placing the intermediate clause in a parenthesis and closely uniting the verse with the next. “Ὅτι will then have the sense of *that*. The meaning thus elicited is undoubtedly good. The unhappy condition of the creature will be represented as, nevertheless, one of exalted hope of future deliverance and glory. We ought, however, whether this view be adopted or not, to reject the parenthesis; for the statements which it contains are too important and too intimately allied to the leading train of thought, to be regarded as omissible or even secondary in value. But it is better to complete the period with this verse and to begin a new one with the next, rendering *ὅτι because*, as in our translation and in those of Rheims and Geneva, or *for*, as in Wiclif, Tyndale, and Cranmer. The Vulgate adopts the same construction, and translates *quia*. Thus there will be a positive statement of future deliverance and fruition of glory, while in the other case, the creature in its state of subjection, will merely be represented as cherishing a rightful hope. The former sense is the fuller of the two. Both agree well with vs. 24, 25.—“The bondage of corruption,” is the wretched state of slavery to sin, and subjection to misery, which is its unfailing attendant. Comp. 2 Pet. ii. 12, 19, and Jude 10, Gal. vi. 8, Eph. iv. 22. *Εἰς* expresses the condition of glorious freedom from sin and suffering in which the children of God shall be placed.

22, 23. The verbs here employed fitly represent the painful distress attendant on the efforts to be made in order to rise from present degradation to ultimate bliss. Inasmuch as this bliss is the state of filiation into which we are ~~partially~~ born again here by the Spirit, (John iii. 6,) and completely in the great “regeneration when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory,” (Matt. xix. 28,) and “he that raised up Christ shall also quicken our mortal bodies on account of his indwelling spirit,” (Rom. viii. 11;) the figure chosen whereby to express those efforts is taken from parturition, the anguish of which is sustained in the hope that a child of God is being born into the kingdom of heaven: Comp. John xvi. 21. The prepositions in composition express the general condition of the whole mass. The inward earnest longings of true Christians after the fulness of redemption in the glorified condition of perfect sonship, are now placed in contradistinction to the painful efforts of mankind in general before the period of the Gospel revelation.

<p>ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στεν- άζομεν νόθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμε- νοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώ- ματος ἡμῶν. Τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι</p>	<p>have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within our- selves, waiting for the adoption, <i>to</i> <i>wit</i>, the redemption of our body. For we are saved by hope: but hope 24</p>
---	---

“And not only:” Here we must supply from the former verse the words “the whole creation.” A similar ellipsis occurs in ix. 10: “and not only” was this so in the case of Sarah, “but” &c. “The first-fruits” were portions of the harvest which were cut the earliest, and were offered to God. See Levit. xxiii. 10, and Deut. xxvi. 2. Hence the word is used by a figure to denote the early converts of a place. Rom. xvi. 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 15. It is applied also to Christ as being “the first born from the dead,” after whom they that belong to him are to be raised. Col. i. 18, 1 Cor. xv. 23. Here it means the gracious influences of the Spirit given to the early converts as an earnest and pledge of his most abundant communications to be afterwards dispensed.—“Even we ourselves:” A comparison of ancient authorities shows a vast variety of readings here. But this is of very little consequence, as the alteration produced thereby in the meaning is quite inconsiderable. They may be seen in Griesbach, or any good critical edition.—“The adoption:” In some degree Christians have already received this benefit. Comp. vs. 15, 16, and 1 John iii. 2. But here the word is employed in its fullest signification, comprehending those blessings which are connected with the resurrection of the body, here called its “redemption.” This word, which is sometimes equivalent to “forgiveness of sins,” (Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14,) is here used in its most extensive meaning. So also is it in 1 Cor. i. 30, “wisdom and justification and sanctification and *redemption* ;” also in Eph. i. 14, “until the *redemption* of the purchased possession ;” and in iv. 30, “ye are sealed unto the day of *redemption*.” It expresses therefore the final resurrection, when the bodies of them that sleep in Christ shall be raised, changed and made spiritual, and consequently forever delivered from corruption and all the effects of sin. See 1 Cor. xv. 42–44, and Phil. iii. 21. All this is in perfect harmony with the language of our Lord to the Sadducees respecting the future condition of the just: “They are the sons of *God* being the sons of the resurrection:” Luke xx. 36. The latter condition is inseparably associated with the former. The same word “adoption” or filiation or sonship, expresses the incipient, present, and imperfect relation to God, and also the same relation in its most exalted significancy.

24, 25. “For” is illative of what has just been said. The imperfection of our present condition requires the exercise of hope of a better one. “By hope:” If this be the correct translation, then hope is to be regarded as one among other Christian properties tending to secure our salvation, in-

that is seen, is not hope : for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope 25 for ? But if we hope for that we see not, <i>then</i> do we with patience 26 wait for <i>it</i> . Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities : for we know not what we should pray for	ἐσώθημεν · ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς · ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει ; Εἰ δὲ ὁ οὐ 25 βλέπομεν, ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπο- μονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. Ὡσαύτως 26 δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμ- βάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν · τὸ
--	--

asmuch as we are led thereby to adhere and persevere. But probably the dative ἐλπίδι, expresses our condition. The meaning will then be, we are in a state of salvation, in which hope is to be continually exercised. Men are said to be saved, when they have accepted the Gospel ; and hence it is that believers are called *the saved* and unbelievers *the lost*. See Acts ii. 47, 2 Cor. ii. 15, iv. 3.—“Seen :” This means in present possession as something external, and is equivalent to enjoyed. It is as if the author had said, ‘hope enjoyed is not properly hope.’ Τί is rendered in our translation “why ;” *how* is perhaps preferable. Hope produces patient and persevering expectation.—The word as first employed in these verses comprises the principle, afterwards it denotes the object on which the principle acts. Faith also is sometimes used in the same way.

26, 27. “Likewise :” That is, according to some, in our Christian condition, in which we cherish a hope, the Spirit helpeth, &c. It is simpler, however, to regard the word as expressing a comparison, thus : as hope sustains, so also does the Spirit assist us during our earthly sojourn.—There is no reason to give any other meaning to the word Spirit in these verses than that in which it has been used before in vs. 4–6, 9, 11, 13–16, 23.—“Helpeth,” συναντιλαμβάνεται. St. Paul scarcely ever employs this preposition in composition without conveying some additional meaning to that of the simple verb. Indeed in about 120 instances, I have only found three cases which may be regarded as exceptions. Here it may have an intensive meaning ; or, it may denote concurrent assistance. In the latter case, its connection will not be with “infirmities,” as these do not contribute, but, on the contrary, require aid. It is best to associate the assistance of the Spirit with that ascribed to hope ; although it is by means of, and in union with this principle, that the Spirit often acts. One illustration follows. We are ignorant both as respects the subjects and the manner of prayer ; and hence the Spirit intercedes for us. The meaning is, he enables us to intercede. In the words of St. Augustin, Spiritus sanctus in nobis gemit, quia gemere nos facit. And again : Gemere dicit Spiritum, quod nos gemere faciat caritate.* The principle on which such language is used has already been stated on ver. 15, p. 132. This inter-

* In Joan. Evang. Cap. i. Tract. vi. Sect. 2, Opera, Edit. Bened., Tom. iii. Par. ii. Ant. 1700, col. 241. Also, Expos. Prop. ex. Epist. ad Rom. Ibid. col. 665.

γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ as we ought: but the Spirit itself
 οὐκ οἶδαμεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦ- maketh intercession for us with
 μα ὑπερευτυχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν groanings which cannot be uttered.
 27 στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις. Ὁ δὲ And he that searcheth the hearts 27
 ἔρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδε, τί τὸ knoweth what is the mind of the
 φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ Spirit, because he maketh interces-
 θεὸν ἐντυχάνει ὑπὲρ ἀγίων. sion for the saints according to *the*
 28 Οἶδαμεν δέ, ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι will of God. And we know that 28

cession is said to be with unutterable or unuttered groanings; that is, with most earnest emotion, with feeling too deep for utterance. "He that searcheth the hearts:" This is a periphrasis for God as omniscient. The verb expresses thorough knowledge, and is thus used in 1 Cor. ii. 10.—"The mind of the Spirit" is the intention of the Spirit, which leads him to prompt and direct the Christian's prayer; or the disposition, character, and desire, which he implants in the Christian, and which leads to such supplication.—Ὅτι may be rendered "because," and then the meaning will be that God knows and approves the Spirit's intention, inasmuch as it is in accordance with his will. Or, it may be translated *that*, and then the thought will be, God knoweth that the intention of the Spirit is according to his will. Κατὰ θεόν, literally, according to God, is equivalent to according to the will of God. Comp. 1 John v. 14, where the full phrase occurs. In 2 Cor. xi. 17, κατὰ Κύριον is employed in a similar way.

28. The proposition in this verse is, that all things co-operate to the advantage of God's loving children; and, in the following ones, for to do good to such is his eternal purpose, and this he intends to carry into effect.—From the construction of the verse it has been argued as follows: 'It is to them that love God that all things are to work together for good; such lovers of God are therefore the called according to his purpose.' This is the inference, and to love God is said to be the condition of being called. Now let us reverse the position of the logical terms. 'It is to the called according to God's purpose that all things are to work together for good; such called are said to love God. The inference therefore is that to become the lovers of God we must have been those who were to be called.' The one course of argument is just as logical as the other; and, as they prove contrary conclusions, they prove nothing. Most likely the theological controversies which gave rise to the above specimens of logic, were unknown to the author from whose statements they are thought to be derived. He describes a certain class of persons in two aspects; they love God, and they are the called according to his purpose. Whether the former is the ground of the latter, or the latter of the former; whether they become the called because they loved, or whether they love because they were the called, is a mere matter of speculation, of which St. Paul does not say one

all things work together for good τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς

word. Neither would expositors have thought of drawing an argument on the one side or the other, if their minds had not been prepossessed by a system. The words describe true Christians. These cannot but love God; they cannot but be the called ones according to his purpose.—“The called” means those who have received the Gospel. See note on i. 6, p. 22.

What is the purpose referred to? A most important question; the answer to which I shall endeavour to give from a view of what the Scripture states on this much controverted subject.

The noun is employed in the New Testament twelve times, of which only four have any bearing on the topic to be considered, namely Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11, and 2 Tim. i. 9. The verb occurs three times, Eph. i. 9 alone having the same bearing. These places must be carefully examined.

Omitting the first, as that is the one to be illustrated, I begin with the second; the meaning of which is almost self-evident. “The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand,” &c. This relates to the divine intention as shown in the choice of Jacob, in preference to Esau, to become the father of the favoured progeny with whom God would renew his covenant relation.

The texts in Ephesians mutually illustrate each other. In i. 9, God is said to “have made known the mystery of his will;” that is, his will heretofore concealed or but imperfectly revealed, as the word *mystery* often signifies: See the note on xi. 25: “according to his good pleasure;” that is, his benevolent intention, “which he hath purposed in himself.” The next two verses may assist us in forming an idea of what God is here said to have purposed. “That he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him; in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being (or having been) predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.” It is evident from these words, that God’s purpose, or good pleasure which he had purposed, is not limited to man, but comprehends also celestial beings. An attempt indeed has been made to show that “things in heaven and on earth” mean Jews and Gentiles. But such an interpretation is entirely unsupported, and needs no refutation. It is the union of angels and men in one spiritual body with Christ. And this view is in harmony with several other places. Compare particularly Eph. iii. 15, Col. i. 20, Heb. xii. 22, and note John i. 51. And true Christians, for they most certainly are intended by “we,” are represented as a part of this great body, and admitted to the enjoyment of its privileges. These privileges, mentioned under the figure of an inheritance, are the benefits of Messiah’s king-

ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλη- to them that love God, to them who

dom, both in this world and in the next. This predestination is affirmed to be in accordance with the purpose of God, who does every thing as his own will prompts, in other words, as he pleases, which, of course, must always imply infinite wisdom and benevolence. In the 4th and 5th verses of Ephesians, God's predestination and choice are represented as anterior to the creation. This and other statements of the same kind are in accommodation to human imperfection. We speak of God as foreseeing the fall, planning a scheme of redemption, choosing, predestinating, before the world or in eternity. But all this is language accommodated to our finite conceptions. With God there can be neither past nor future plans or events; everything is equally open before him as now taking place. Inasmuch as this is the constant, never-beginning, never-ending purpose of God, it is represented to us as formed before the creation, in eternity, ere the notation of time could be marked.

Further, this predestination and choice have heavenly blessings in view. No candid man can read and reflect on what the New Testament says on this subject without acknowledging this. It is impossible to limit these representations to a merely outward covenant relation, existing on earth and temporary, as members of Christ's visible church. It is also internal, spiritual, heavenly, an adoption intended to be perfect and eternal; a purpose, having in view our ultimate holiness and consequent happiness.

In Eph. iii. 11, the same general idea is presented: "According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." In order to ascertain what it is that is said to accord with this purpose, we must examine the preceding context. In the commencement of the chapter the Apostle alludes to the trials he was enduring for the Gentiles. This leads him to introduce what he calls a "mystery of Christ." This, as I have before remarked, is something heretofore but little or not at all known, as he immediately afterwards says. He explains his meaning to be, the union of Gentiles with Jews in the church of Christ, and the equal admission of both to the benefit of Messiah's kingdom; 1-8. This blessing, intended for Gentiles, it is his province to develop and show to the world; and this, in order that the church might become the occasion, and even means, of making known God's most extraordinary wisdom. And then he adds: "According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." It has been hence inferred, that God's "purpose" as stated in St. Paul's epistles, is, to unite Jews and Gentiles in the church of Christ. Had the inference been limited to the statement, that this entered into or made a part of the divine purpose, it would doubtless be true. But to say that it constitutes *the purpose* is erroneous. It is the same thing as inferring an important doctrine from one text, when others bear upon the doctrine, and modify or amplify the view, which might seem to be the inference from

the text had it stood alone. In other words, it is drawing a general conclusion from a particular premise. This, most unfortunately, is a treatment to which the *word* of God has often been subjected. In reference to his *works*, philosophy scorns such a procedure, and regards those who act thus as unworthy of confidence. The careful and conscientious inquirer both in natural science and revealed religion, will examine all the known facts that bear upon the point to be elucidated, and will draw his inferences accordingly. The logical conclusion from this passage is, that the union of Jews and Gentiles in the one church of Christ is the mystery here referred to, and that this union is "according to God's purpose." But *the purpose* may have comprehended a vast deal more. And so doubtless it did. And that the Apostle had a vast deal more in view is certain, and made evident from the context. For there he not only speaks of heavenly principalities and powers deriving divine knowledge from God's church, but speaks of "the whole family" (or, every family, according to the more accurate rendering of the Greek and the best of the Greek fathers,) "in heaven and earth as named" of Christ. This corresponds with what was before said, and confirms the view that God's purpose regards angels as well as men. Hence it is, that the reconciliation of men to God through the atonement of Christ, and the association of angels with those so reconciled, all forming one holy body in blessed union with God, and with Christ their head, is plainly declared to be a Christian doctrine, partly in the places already noted, and further in Col. i. 18, 20, and Heb. xii. 22, 23.

The connection in which God's purpose is mentioned in 2 Tim. i. 9, is very similar to that in the passage under consideration. "God hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Here it is necessary to remark, that the word "given" is not to be limited to the "grace," but relates also to the "purpose" spoken of. It may be applied to both nouns by a zeugma,* and mean 'purpose with regard to and grace given.' The grace is said to be given "before the world began," or from eternity. The Greek is, *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*, literally, *before eternal times*, or, *eternal times ago*; and the construction corresponds exactly with that in 2 Cor. xii. 2, *πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων*, "*fourteen years ago*." The Apostle's meaning is that even then it was God's purpose to bestow this grace. Thus the language is the same as that constantly employed in legal transactions; just as property is said to be given to unborn heirs by the testamentary disposition made by an ancestor. Comp. Gal. i. 15, where St. Paul is said to have been "separated from his mother's womb;" where, beyond all doubt, the reference is to the divine intention.

God's purpose then embraces the whole series of divine arrangements,

* See note on Heb. ix. 23, p. 131.

appliances and operations, connected with salvation by Christ. It was his purpose to redeem fallen man by the atonement of his Son and the agency of his Spirit; and so redeemed, to unite them under Christ in one holy body with the angels of heaven. Consequently, they are called out of the world into his church, and supplied with whatever is necessary to their ultimate and everlasting happiness in glory. God's purpose has in view all that this result requires, and also the result itself. That this result shall really take place, however, is not a necessary consequence of this divine purpose. The language of Scripture by which this whole subject is expressed is not philosophical. When, in this connection, it speaks of God's will, it is universally acknowledged that it speaks in terms adapted to the ordinary mind; and *his will may fail of accomplishment*. This is undeniable with regard to all such places as 1 Tim. ii. 4, where it is said that God "will have," literally, *willeth*, "all men to be saved." And there is no good reason for supposing that the same is not equally true of what the Scripture calls his *purpose* and *determination* represented as formed before the foundation of the world. Will any one venture to prove that God's *will* is less absolute and certain than his *purpose*?

Perhaps it may be objected that the words *purpose*, *determine*, *decree*, are stronger than *will*; and therefore that, while the latter may in multitudes of cases fail of accomplishment, the former never can. To this I would reply as follows: The strength of the objection seems to depend rather on our habits of thinking than on any real difference as respects God. The word *decree* contains no further idea than *determination* or *purpose*, whatever may have become technically its philosophical or theological meaning. And God's intention or purpose is identical with his will. Thus we find that the Apostle speaks of the *will* of God in immediate connection with what he says of his *purpose*. Compare, "that the *purpose* of God according to election might stand" in ix. 11, with, "he hath mercy on whom he *will* and whom he *will* he hardeneth," and "who hath resisted his *will*," in vs. 18, 19. In the same way he speaks also in his Epistle to the Ephesians. "According as God hath *chosen* us, &c., having *predestinated* us &c. according to the good pleasure of his *will*:"—"The mystery of his *will*, according to his good pleasure which he hath *purposed* in himself:—Being *predestinated* according to the *purpose* of him who worketh all things after the *counsel* of his own *will*:" i. 4–11. In the Greek *βούλημα* and *θέλημα* are both expressed by the same English word *will*, "*counsel*" in Ephesians being in the original *βουλήν*; and the same verb *θέλω* is used in the texts before cited from Romans and Timothy. God's *intention*, or *purpose* or *decree*, then, is nothing more than his expressed *will*.

To return then to the text: The called according to his purpose, are true Christians who have embraced the Gospel made known to them

are the called according to *his* pur- 29
 29 pose. For whom he did foreknow, *τοῖς οὖσιν. Ὅτι οὖς προέγνω, 29*
 he also did predestinate *to be* con- *καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰ-*
 formed to the image of his Son, that *κόνοσ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι*
αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς

in accordance with God's eternal purpose to effect, in the manner and way stated, their everlasting salvation.

29, 30. These verses represent God's carrying out his purpose before mentioned so far as regards the "*family* on earth." See Eph. iii. 15. The particle "for" denotes this connection.

"Whom he did foreknow:" In the usual meaning attached to the word *knowledge* with the prefix *fore*, the word would express a trifling truism. In this sense God foreknows everything, however unimportant. Such a frigid view must of course be rejected, as unworthy of the writer.

Some give the meaning as follows, 'whom he before knew would accept the Gospel.' But this adds to the text. It is the commentator's idea, but it may not be the author's. Besides, it makes the next clause worse than a tautology, the Apostle gravely saying that those, whose moral character God foresaw would lead them to accept the Gospel, were by him predetermined to be conformed to Christ. The only way of removing the absurdity of this statement is to say, that the predetermined conformity does not comprehend moral character. But this is a mere begging the point, and cannot be admitted.

The meaning of *predetermined*, is by many maintained to be the idea of this *foreknowing*. Olshausen, after saying that in the latter word "the property of the divine *knowledge* only," and in the former "that of the *will* alone is marked," and that "both appear combined in the *purpose*," allows that "nevertheless there seems to be no difference here between, *he did foreknow*, and, *he did predestinate*."

Now it may be admitted that *προγινώσκειν*, *to know before*, is sometimes employed in the sense of *προορίζειν*, *to determine before*. This is probably the case in 1 Pet. i. 20, "foreordained (*προεγνωσμένον*) before the foundation of the world, but manifest in these last times." This meaning agrees best with the antithesis which the text manifestly requires: *predetermined* but *now made known*. But still it is very improbable that in this verse of Romans the same meaning simply should be conveyed by both words. In every other instance which occurs in this connection, each verb has its own distinct signification. It is not to be presumed that this constitutes an isolated exception. The writer just quoted states that "in the verse before us it is only *conformed to the image* &c. that forms the advance in the thought." But this is mere unsupported assertion. We must therefore endeavour to give to the word some definite meaning of its own, in harmony with scriptural usage and with the context.

30 ἀδελφοῖς· οὓς δὲ προώρισε, τού- he might be the first-born among
τους καὶ ἐκάλεσε· καὶ οὓς ἐκάλ- many brethren. Moreover, whom 30
εσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· he did predestinate, them he also
οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ called; and whom he called, them

The simple verb *to know* often conveys the idea of having the mind kindly fixed on, regarding with unusual tenderness. Thus in Ps. i. 6, "The Lord *knoweth* the way of the righteous;" in Amos iii. 2, "You only have I *known* of all the families of the earth;" in 1 Cor. viii. 3, "If any man love God, the same is *known* of him;" Gal. iv. 9, "Now, after that ye have known God, or rather, are *known* of God;" 1 Thess. v. 12, "To *know* them that labour among you." And thus we may interpret Rom. xi. 2, "God hath not rejected his people whom he *foreknew*," in other words regarded with kindness; and 1 Pet. i. 2, "elect according to the *foreknowledge* of God," meaning his eternal kind regard. On this ground the Scripture uniformly places God's benevolent course of conduct towards his ancient people the Hebrews, and also towards those whom he hath blessed with a knowledge of his Gospel. This must be known to every reader of the Bible, and therefore I shall refer to only one or two illustrations. In Deut. vii. 8, the reason stated for God's choosing the Hebrews is: "because the Lord *loved you*." In Eph. ii. 4, we find God's "great love" given as the reason of his life-giving favours; and therefore the beloved disciple says: "We love him, because he first *loved* us." 1 John iv. 19.

The most probable meaning therefore of the word under consideration seems to be this: 'Whom he before (of old, that is, as shown by passages before alleged, from eternity,) regarded with affection.'

Between *συμμόρφους* and *προώρισε* we must understand *γενέσθαι*. We have a similar ellipsis of *εἶναι* in i. 17. The conformity to the image of Christ which God's predetermination had in view, appears to be very general in its nature. It comprehends a conformity in afflictions, (ver. 17, 1 Pet. iv. 1,) in holiness, (Rom. vi. 3-7,) and in future happiness (vi. 8, viii. 17.)—"First-born:" Among the Hebrews the eldest son had peculiar privileges. He took precedence over the other children, and had a double portion of the patrimonial estate. See Gen. xxv. 31-34, Deut. xxi. 17, and 1 Chron. v. 1, 2. Some writers, both ancient and modern, add the priesthood; but this is uncertain. The word *first-born* therefore is sometimes equivalent to *heir* or *lord*, and thus it is used here. Jewish writers apply the same term to the Messiah.

30. This verse expresses the manner in which God carries out his eternal purpose, so far as regards his course of influence and operation towards men. Them whom he had previously intended to be conformed to the likeness of Christ "he called." This expresses something more than a mere invitation to the blessings of the Gospel, namely, its acceptance. See

ver. 28, and note on i. 6.—“Justified :” that is, admitted to a state of acceptableness with himself as a necessary consequence of forgiveness. See note on iv. 6–8, pp. 63, 64.—“Glorified :” Locke’s addition, “in his purpose,” is entirely without authority, and also unnecessary ; inasmuch as the divine purpose had been stated before. Neither is there any propriety in attaching to the verb a present or a future sense. Those with which it is immediately connected are in the same tense, and evidently relate to what is past. He forereminded ; he predetermined ; he called ; he justified ; of course, the next must mean, he glorified. All difficulty vanishes, when we keep in mind two considerations. First, the glorification referred to comprehends the present benefits of the Gospel which Christians now enjoy, the amelioration of their condition already produced, the gifts and graces of the Spirit already bestowed, and the reasonable expectation of future glory which the believer anticipates. Theodoret has in mind the same view, although he does not sufficiently draw out the thought : “Having justified, he glorified (them,) naming them sons, and giving to them the grace of the Holy Spirit.” Ubi sup. pp. 68, 69. Secondly, the future full enjoyment of the blessings of Christ’s kingdom do as certainly belong to the true Christian, as if he were already in possession of them. So long as he preserves the real Christian character, the full fruition is his right. The present benefits actually attained, and the certainty of the believer’s claim to the future, are expressed by a past tense, “he glorified.” This is in accordance with the language of prophecy, which speaks of prospective blessings as already existing and being enjoyed. Indeed so far does St. Paul carry out this view, that he represents Christians as not only quickened, but also raised with Christ, and made to sit with him in heaven. See Eph. ii. 5, 6. The circumstance of death, though regarded by short-sighted mortals as terminating life and enjoyment, seems to be overlooked by the inspired Apostles, and they speak of everlasting glory and eternal life as already begun. Comp. John iii. 36. “He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life ;” and xvii. 22, “the glory which thou gavest me I *have* given them.” That the word here employed might be used of present glory is evident from what was said on vs. 18, 19 ; and that this is at least a part of what the Apostle means, is made highly probable from the question in the next verse.

The reader will bear in mind that, in the whole of this portion which treats of God’s benevolent purpose towards those who love him and are his called ones, and of the method employed by him to carry it into effect, the Apostle speaks exclusively of Christians ; and, on the presumption that they are what they profess to be, that is, sincere believers. To suppose that these blessings are affirmed of all professing Christians indiscriminately—hypocrites, for instance, like Simon Magus—would be preposterous, contrary alike to reason and Scripture. The difficulty cannot be evaded by attempting to limit the Apostle’s idea to those present benefits of

Christianity, of which all who are connected with it by outward covenant relation partake; for the statements are too strong to bear such a limitation, which makes a frigid sense, quite unworthy of the whole context and of the plain object of the writer. It is impossible to doubt that he comprehends the full magnitude of the glory of Christ's eternal kingdom. And the language of 1 Pet. v. 10, is particularly worthy of attention: "The God of all grace who hath called us to his *eternal* glory by Christ Jesus." Compare also iii. 9. In 2 Thess. ii. 13, it is said: "God hath from the beginning chosen you to *salvation*." The calling has in view the everlasting happiness of the called. And the calling and the predestinating and the afore-regarding with affection, are too closely associated to be dis severed in a candid mind. Olshausen says with truth: "It is to blessedness that election in St. Paul's language refers." Undoubtedly it does, comprehending also all those subordinate advantages obtained in the church on earth, which tend to prepare men for the ultimate enjoyment of that blessedness. The expressions of Dr. Peile are accurate and true: The "chosen, after the counsel of His will who is the unseen worker of the whole scheme of mercy, (Eph. i. 4, 11,) are *called to be*, and so, in the use of all the appliances and means which He hath given them for this purpose, *are in the way to be*, and by natural consequence, (which yet they have the power always to intercept in its progress and defeat,) *should be* eventually, *inheritors of salvation*." On Heb. i. 14.

Neither is it satisfactory to say that the Apostle is not speaking of individuals but communities. As all communities are made up of individuals, his statements must regard them as such, otherwise he would be speaking in the abstract, and this would give very poor consolation to the suffering individuals, sustaining persecutions for Christ's sake, whom he addresses. The true view is, that real Christian character is presumed of all those to whom the statements apply. And the same remark holds good of all such places as affirm the eternal salvation of Christ's members, whether they are described as believers, in reference to the principle which unites them to their Lord, or, by a figure, are called lambs or sheep. If God's purpose be equivalent to his will, then, as was before remarked, the absolute certainty of the result is not to be assumed. Whether, in the case of each individual it shall be carried into effect, may depend upon the use made of the opportunities and means of grace afforded him in Christ's church. And in accordance with this view is the exhortation, "give diligence to make your calling and election sure:" 2 Pet. i. 10.

In view of the above statement it may be asked, if the discourse relates exclusively to Christians, what does the Apostle here teach respecting others. I answer, nothing. Not that he means that there is no divine purpose respecting them, but he passes it over, simply because it does not comport with the scope of his subject to mention it. There is scarcely an

- he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.
- 31 What shall we then say to these things? If God *be* for us, who *can*
- 32 *be* against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?
- 33 Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? *It is* God

ἐδόξασε. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς 31
ταῦτα; εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς
καθ' ἡμῶν; "Οσγε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ 32
οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, πῶς
οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα
ἡμῖν χαρίσεται; Τίς ἐγκαλέσει 33
κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; θεὸς ὁ δι-

error of interpretation more mischievous than that which makes a sacred writer's language determine points which do not come within his field of view. The Apostle's discourse relates to Christians. God's purpose with regard to all others, if learned at all, must be learned elsewhere. In Luke xx. 35, 36, 1 Cor. xv., and Phil. iii. 11, the resurrection of those who are Christ's is the subject. Whatever relates to the resurrection of the wicked must be sought in other parts of the Bible. This principle is applied, without the least hesitation, to compositions in general. Thus, for instance, in our collect for Good Friday, we pray as follows: "Graciously behold this thy family, for which our Lord Jesus Christ was contented to be betrayed, and given up into the hands of wicked men, and to suffer death upon the cross." The prayer, no doubt, comprehends the whole Christian church. But who would hence infer that it was intended to limit to this community the benefits of Christ's death? The interpreter who would ascertain the exact sense of Scripture must be careful not to append to the text what it does not contain, nor to draw conclusions from it which it does not sanction.

31, 32. This appeal is founded on what had just been said. The comprehensive expression "for us all" recognises the universality of the divine intention, and the union of Gentiles and Jews in the church of Christ. Compare the language of St. Peter in Acts xi. 17.

33-37. From the time of St. Augustin to the present, some of the most profound and judicious expositors have preferred the interrogative punctuation. It imparts a vividness and boldness to the thought, quite in character with the Apostle's intensity of feeling and elevation of mind. No wonder that Erasmus, imbued with all that classical antiquity contains of the beautiful and sublime, should indulge his feeling in the appropriate words, quid usquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius! The objection of Tholuck and Stuart to the number of the questions is not of much weight. The latter author enumerates 17, but they may easily be reduced to 8, as the clauses and words in vs. 34, 35, are mere amplifications of that which introduces them, and, except this and the last in each verse, might be pointed with commas.

34 *καὶ ὧν; Τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Χρισ-* that justifieth. Who is he that 34
τὸς ὁ ἀποθανών, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ condemneth? *It is* Christ that
ἐγερθείς, ὃς καὶ ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ died, yea rather, that is risen again,
τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει who is even at the right hand of
 35 *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; Τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει* God, who also maketh intercession
ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; for us. Who shall separate us from 35

His objection from the want of answers is met by the remark, that each question contains the answer in itself.

“Elect.” This word simply expresses two particulars; namely, that those so called have been chosen to all the blessings of Christ’s kingdom in accordance with God’s purpose before explained, and that they are choice ones and beloved by God. In the Septuagint the word is used of Joshua, the chosen and choice servant of Moses: Num. xi. 28; of Moses the chosen one of God: Ps. cv. 23; of David, chosen and exalted by God to be the head of his people: Ps. lxxxviii. 20; of the Messiah, represented under the figure of a chosen foundation-stone: Isa. xxviii. 16. It is used also both in the singular and plural of the Hebrew people, as God’s peculiar and chosen nation. See Isa. xlii. 1, which, although referring undoubtedly to the Messiah, is interpreted by the Septuagint translators of Israel, and xlv. 4, for the singular; and, for the plural, 1 Chron. xvi. 13, Ps. lxxxviii. 4, (3,) civ. (cv.) 6, 43, cv. (cvi.) 5. These expressions correspond with the language of Moses: “Because he loved thy fathers, had a delight in thy fathers to love them, therefore he *chose* their seed after them.” Deut. iv. 37, x. 15. In the New Testament, it denotes Christians regarded as chosen and beloved by God. And thus, in xi. 7, the abstract “election” denotes that portion of the Jews who, by divine grace, had embraced the Gospel. In every case a conformity in heart and life to its requisitions, is presumed, and so the word elect was employed by those very early Christian writers, who are known as the Apostolical fathers. Thus, in the Shepherd of Hermas, “his elect” occurs in connection with “his church;” also,—“You can relate these things to the elect of God;—the Lord hath sworn respecting his elect, that if any one sin he shall not have that salvation;—go and relate his mighty deeds to the elect of God.”* In the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp contained in the epistle of the church of Smyrna and preserved by Eusebius, “the elect” and “the unbelievers” are set in opposition, and “this most admirable person,” Polycarp, mentioned as one of the former.† And Clement in his epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 29, after saying that God ‘has made us a portion of his own election,’ illustrates his meaning by referring to Deut. xxxii. 8, 9, and iv. 34, where the

* Vision I. chap. iii. vis. II. i. ii. vis. IV. ii. Pat. Apost. Edit. Cotel. Ant. 1700, vol. I. pp. 76, 77, 88.

† Eus. Eccles. Hist. Lib. iv. cap. xv. p. 134. Edit. Paris. 1659.

the love of Christ? <i>Shall</i> tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the	θλίψις; ἢ στενοχωρία; ἢ διωγμός; ἢ λιμός; ἢ γυμνότης; ἢ κίνδυνος; ἢ μάχαιρα; καθὼς 36 γέγραπται· ὅτι ἕνεκεν σοῦ θανατοόμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν· ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφα-
--	--

choice of the Hebrews as a people is the subject.—The confident and triumphant challenge of St. Paul, is strikingly similar to that which Isaiah puts into the mouth of the Messiah, in l. 8, 9. Indeed the Septuagint has the very words, *ὁ δικαίωσας* and *ὁ κρινόμενος*. Either the Apostle quoted the prophet; or, more probably, the same excellent feeling in both prompted the same natural expressions of faith and joyous confidence.

“The Love of Christ:” Some ancient authorities read *of God*, but the common reading is much better supported. The general meaning would be the same in either case, as Scripture often predicates indifferently the same thing of God and of Christ. The love spoken of is undoubtedly Christ’s love to us, not ours to him, as some have supposed. It must be granted that the words immediately following do seem to support the latter exposition, as it is difficult to conceive how the Apostle could represent affliction and persecution as at all likely to sever Christ’s affection from his chosen ones, while they would rather tend to unite the beloved parties the more closely. Still there are weighty considerations which decide in favour of the other meaning. The phrase, or its synonyme, “love of God,” most generally in the epistles means, *love exercised towards us*. So in the other three places in which it occurs in this Epistle, v. 5. 8, viii. 39. The language in ver. 37, “through him that loved us,” coincides with this view, which is also in harmony with the exposition before given of “foreknow” in ver. 29. Besides, the phrase, ‘to separate us from the love that we feel for another,’ is without any sanction either of analogy or propriety. The afflictions and persecutions spoken of could only tend to sever Christ’s love to his people by inducing them first to relax their attachment and obedience to him, thus exercising a reflex influence.

But the Apostle declares that over all these evils the Christian triumphs through the might of the divine love. This love so orders all the events of life, even the most distressing, that they subserve the best interests of the true believer. “More than conquer,” that is, ‘conquer exceedingly.’ It is equivalent to ‘triumph.’—“Through him that loved us:” Several manuscripts, versions and fathers read in the accusative, *on account of*; but the genitive reading *through* has the greatest weight of external testimony. It is also more in harmony with the context, as it refers to God or Christ as the source of that power which makes the Christian victorious. What follows, taken in connection with the previous context, has been

37 γῆς. Ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν
 ὑπερνικῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαν-
 38 τος ἡμᾶς. Πέπεισμαι γάρ, ὅτι
 οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή, οὔτε
 ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί, οὔτε ἐνε-
 στῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα, οὔτε δυ-
 39 νάμεις, οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος,
 οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται
 ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης
 τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
 τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

slaughter. Nay, in all these things 37
 we are more than conquerors,
 through him that loved us. For I 38
 am persuaded, that neither death,
 nor life, nor angels, nor principal-
 ties, nor powers, nor things present,
 nor things to come, nor height, 39
 nor depth, nor any other creature,
 shall be able to separate us from the
 love of God, which is in Christ
 Jesus our Lord.

thought to sustain a doctrine much cherished by many excellent Christians, namely, that of the perseverance of the saints, or, as it has been also named, the indefectibility of grace in the elect. But the reader whose mind has been borne along with that of the writer in his sublime elevation of Christian trust, will readily perceive that he is not laying down a doctrine, but expressing a persuasion, a deep feeling of the utter impossibility of any created thing being able to separate the devoted one from him whom his soul loveth. The language in Phil. i. 6, where he expresses his persuasion, (for the Greek word is the same in both places,) in reference to his dearly beloved converts who had shown their filial regard for him, is of the same character, and might be adduced to illustrate what is here meant. The Apostle expresses his strong confidence, that true Christians shall forever enjoy the blessings which the love of Christ had procured. He declares that no trials, however great and various, shall destroy their connection with their Saviour, and then expresses in animated language his persuasion that no external power of any kind shall be able to produce this effect. The reader will do well to compare the declarations in John x. 28, 29, which our Lord makes of his sheep. Who and what they are must be gathered from other passages.—With ver. 36 compare Ps. xlv. 22, (Sept. xliii. 23,) which is here accommodated. The expressions which follow are to be understood generally of all powers which may be supposed to contend with the Christian. Koppe very judiciously remarks, that it is the whole idea in the Apostle's mind which is to be attended to, and that we are not to inquire how every individual being here specified, angels for instance, can be regarded as opposing the Christian's faith and virtue. To illustrate the observation, he refers to 1 Cor. iii. 22, and Gal. i. 8. It is plain that, in the last instance, "though an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed," the author puts the most extreme hypothetical case, in order to present in the strongest possible terms the absolute incompatibility of any opposing system with the truth of the Gospel. In Romans the word "angels" im-

plies the idea of beings possessed of extraordinary strength. Comp. Ps. ciii. 20. Many commentators, who have either overlooked or disregarded this consideration, expound the words of evil angels. Height and depth have been thought to refer to heaven and earth, or, figuratively, to the greatest prosperity or adversity.

SECTION XI.

CHAPS. IX. X. XI.

UNBELIEVING JEWS ARE REJECTED AND BELIEVING GENTILES ADMITTED IN THEIR PLACE. YET THE REJECTION OF THE JEWISH NATION IS NOT ABSOLUTELY FINAL AND IRREVOCABLE. ON THEIR REPENTANCE AND FAITH THEY SHALL BE RESTORED.

It is the opinion of several expositors, that the three chapters which immediately follow have no necessary or direct connection with the preceding discussion. Koppe speaks of the subject of them as entirely new, and altogether distinct from the former: *plane novum, nec ulla ratione cum superiorum capitum sententiis cohærens*. But this is certainly a mistake. The Apostle might undoubtedly have brought his argument to a close with the eighth chapter, the termination of which would form a noble peroration, in all respects worthy of the mind and heart of the writer. But the inspired man has not yet developed all his thoughts, not yet poured forth his deepest feelings, not yet advanced to the sublimest climax of his divine aspirations, hopes and belief. He has reasons to give for the rejection of impenitent Jews from the kingdom of the Messiah and the admission therein of believing Gentiles; and in presenting them to his readers, he again explains and enforces the great doctrines of justification by faith and of the comprehensiveness of God's plan of mercy through the Gospel, which form the leading topics already proved and illustrated.

It may be, as Olshausen remarks, that the triumphant language just uttered by the Apostle "awakens powerfully his feelings for his own nation," and leads him to express them in the commencement of this chapter. But, independently of this connection, other considerations might very naturally have produced such an outburst of affection. The former character of Saul of Tarsus had, no doubt, prepared the leading Jews to expect in him the determined advocate of Judaism, and the persevering and relentless opponent of Christianity. His extraordinary conversion was an unexpected death-blow to their hopes. Admiration and respect for his talents and character were changed into the most indignant hatred. They calumniated him as an enemy to their nation, and a traitor to his country's usages and religion. Among the converted Jews, too, there were multi-

IX.	Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ ·	I say the truth in Christ, I lie	IX.
	οὐ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυρούσης	not, my conscience also bearing me	
	μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν πνεύ-	witness in the Holy Ghost, that	2
2	ματι ἁγίῳ, ὅτι λύπη μοί ἐστι	I have great heaviness and contin-	
	μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὁδύνη	ual sorrow in my heart. For I could	3
3	τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. Ἡὕχόμεν γὰρ	wish that myself were accursed	

tudes who pertinaciously adhered to the ritual law. Consequently they could not reconcile with their prejudices the Apostle's views of its utter inefficiency as a means of securing God's favour; and therefore they regarded him with suspicion and distrust. Moreover, the statements which he was about to make respecting the rejection of the Jews and the acceptance of the Gentiles could not but be distasteful to national vanity, and in part unpleasant even to the converted portion of the people. The Apostle therefore introduces these topics with the strongest expressions of attachment to his Israelitish brethren. The good sense and tact and acquaintance with human nature which seem never to forsake him, would of themselves have suggested expressions of fraternal kindness; but, even in the absence of these, such an exordium would be the natural ebullition of that inexhaustible spring of love, which welled out from the depth of his heart.

CHAP. IX. 1-3. Ἐν Χριστῷ. Some regard this as a formula of swearing, and translate, 'by Christ.' But, although the preposition is thus employed, it is usually connected with the verb. The common meaning is preferable; as a true Christian, one united to Christ. Comp. John xv. 4, xvii. 23, 2 Cor. v. 17, xii. 19. Thus it corresponds with the last phrase of the verse, "in" or through "the Holy Ghost:" that is, speaking in harmony with him and under his influence.—"Also" is probably intended to express the force of σύν. The Apostle by employing the preposition denotes the concurrent attestation of his conscience and of the Spirit who guides him. He generally intends the preposition in composition to have its proper meaning. See on viii. 26, p. 144.

"I could wish:" The Apostle of the Gentiles, whose heart was equally devoted to the Jews, thus introduces the avowal of his deep affection for his nation; an affection which has none greater in the history of man, except the not to be known love of Christ, (Eph. iii. 19,) nor equal, unless it be that of the beloved disciple, which prompted the words,* "we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren," (1 John iii. 16,) or of the Hebrew deliverer, who expressed his devotion for his misguided and sinful people in the language, "Blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written:" Ex. xxxii. 32. But still he does not here utter a prayer for his own everlasting destruction, as Chrysostom and others have supposed.* The

* De Sacard. Lib. iv. cap. 6, p. 186, Edit. Joan. Hughes, Cantab. 1710, and Suicer under ἀνάθεμα, I. 2, Tom. I. Col. 270, 271.

from Christ for my brethren, my
 kinsmen according to the flesh :
 4 who are Israelites; to whom *per-* *αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ*
τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν
μου, τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ
σάρκα· οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, 4

word does not express a positive wish. The imperfect is used in the sense of the optative. Tholuck quotes from Photius, 'I could be willing, if it were proper, if it were allowable, if the choice were permitted me.' The same tense is employed in Gal. iv. 20, 'I could desire, *ἤθελον*, to be present,' &c., and in Acts xxv. 22, 'I could wish,' *ἐβουλόμην*.

"Accursed," *ἀνάθεμα* for the older form *ἀνάθημα*. In the New Testament it denotes a person devoted to destruction. See 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22, Gal. i. 8, 9. In order to soften the apparent harshness of the idea, some have supposed a reference to the ruin of impenitent Jews by the overthrow and destruction of their temple and city, brought on by the righteous judgment of Christ, whom they had obstinately rejected. Thus the Apostle is thought to express his willingness, like Moses, to share with his sinful brethren the general excision of the nation. According to this view *ἀπὸ* is to be understood in the sense of *ὑπό* and translated *by*, as both prepositions seem to be used in the same sense in James i. 13, 14: "tempted *by* God," *ἀπό* "by his own lust," *ὑπό*. This, however, is a very uncommon meaning of *ἀπό* and the excision of the Jews is never elsewhere thus spoken of. Others again, influenced by the same desire to modify, have endeavoured to identify the meaning with excision from Christ's church; but without success, for, as Tholuck very justly remarks, this comprehends excision also from Christ himself. To become anathema from Christ is parallel with Gal. v. 4, 'ye have become removed from Christ,' that is, your connection with him has been severed. Comp. Rom. vii. 2, 6, where the same verb is followed by the same preposition.—It seems necessary to allow that the warmth of the Apostle's feelings led him to employ hyperbolical language which must not be too strictly analysed. His general meaning is plain: he is willing to sustain any conceivable evil, which he can rightly undergo, for the benefit of his beloved nation. No motive could properly induce a Christian to desire his own everlasting severance from Christ. That would be to desire not only misery but sin. It would be in a very marked sense of the phrase, to desire "evil that good may come;" a detestable principle, which the Apostle has already stamped with the seal of his reprobation.

4, 5. The Apostle here enumerates some of the privileges of his nation. He purposely selects the term Israelite as being a more honourable appellation than any other that could be employed, having been given to Jacob in token of his prevailing with God. See Gen. xxxii. 28, and compare John i. 47, 2 Cor. xi. 22, Phil. iii. 5.—"Adoption:" acquired sonship, implying fa-

ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ ταινeth the adoption, and the glory,
 διαθηκαὶ καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ and the covenants, and the giving

your, and affectionate union. See Ex. iv. 22, "Israel is my son, my first-born."—"Glory" may express the general dignity to which God had elevated his ancient people; or, if some particular be intended, it may be that of the visible divine appearance expressed by the phrase "the glory of the Lord appeared." See Ex. xvi. 10, xl. 34, Levit. ix. 23, and comp. 1 Sam. iv. 22.—"The covenants:" The plural may be used to denote excellence, as it often is elsewhere. See Heb. ix. 23 and note. Or it may refer to the two tables deposited in the ark, which are called "the covenant" in 1 Kings viii. 21. Tholuck objects to this, that thus understood, the covenants are comprehended within the giving of the law which immediately follows. But the moral law "engraven by the finger of God on the two tables of stone" is so important, that it would be quite natural to bring it prominently before the reader by a special notice. Still it is very probable that the plural has reference to the repeated covenants, or the renewal of the same covenant, made by God with the patriarchs and their descendants. Comp. Eccus. xlv. 11, 2 Macc. viii. 15, Eph. ii. 12, in which places the word is in the plural.—"The giving of the law" implies, of course, the extraordinary and divine attestations which accompanied that event.—"The service" or worship recalls to Jewish readers the former splendour and magnificence of their sacred tabernacle and temple services. Comp. Heb. ix. 1-6.—"The promises" reminds them of their connection with the bountiful author of their religious blessings. The Apostle sums up the catalogue of these by mentioning their venerable ancestors, the patriarchs, from whom sprang the Messiah himself in his human nature. The article limits the bearing of the expression, and the phrase τὸ κατὰ is equivalent to 'simply as respects.'

If the reader wishes to examine thoroughly the various views which have been given of the latter half of this verse by Rationalistic, Socinian, Arian, and other expositors, he must consult the more extended commentaries. The received reading is no doubt correct. The substitution of ὧν ὁ for ὁ ὧν has no better foundation than the conjecture of certain critics, who desired thereby to weaken the evidence of Christ's divinity. It may be said in support of this conjecture, that the substituted reading harmonizes well with the context: 'whose is God blessed forever.' If the external evidence were favourable to the reading which conveys this thought, this reading might certainly be explained in consistency with the context. But it would be necessary to limit its natural full force, otherwise the author would contradict what he had before said in iii. 29, 30, namely, that God is God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. Although a limitation might be pleaded for by such places as Eph. ii. 12, where the Gentiles are repre-

of the law, and the service of God, λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, ὧν 5
 5 and the promises; whose are the οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς
 fathers, and of whom, as concerning τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων

sented as “without God in the world;” yet it is not to be supposed that St. Paul, in his zeal to amplify the benefits of his nation, would make a statement at variance with what he had before said in this same Epistle, and also with what was essential to his general argument. But any reasoning on the point is unnecessary, as the reading is without support.

To destroy or lessen the evidence for Christ’s divinity, resort has been had to a different punctuation from that commonly received. Some place a colon after *σάρκα*, and others after *πάντων*. According to the former construction, the words that follow will be simply a doxology: ‘God, who is over all, be blessed for ever!’ And so also, according to the latter: ‘God be blessed forever!’ Only in this case, the words, “who is over all,” will be predicated of Christ, and express his general supremacy; which, of course, will be modified agreeably to the respective views of the critics who adopt it.

It is unquestionable that ascriptions of glory to God do occur several times in the epistles. See, for examples, Rom. i. 25, 2 Cor. xi. 31, Gal. i. 5, Eph. iii. 20, 21, 1 Tim. i. 17; to which may be added, Clement’s epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 32, 38, 43, 45, 58, 60. And such ascriptions do also occur referring directly to Christ. See 1 Pet. iv. 11, 2 Pet. iii. 18, Rev. v. 12–14; also Clement’s epistle, chap. 20, 50. General usage therefore does not determine whether the doxology under consideration relates to God or to Christ. The strength of the expression “over all,” is no objection to applying it to Christ, for of course the universal father is himself excepted from this category, and expressions equally strong are elsewhere employed of Christ. In Tit. i. 3, he is called “God our Saviour,” and in ii. 13, “the great God and our Saviour.” That the former passage does relate to Christ is evident from the context, which speaks of St. Paul’s having been commanded to preach the Gospel by this Saviour, and also before of God’s eternal promise; and the latter can relate to none other, because the appearing, *ἐπιφάνεια*, of this “great God and Saviour” is the theme of the author, and this appearing is Christ’s.

Two considerations decide in favour of referring the doxology to Christ. First, it is the most natural construction of the words. It makes a suitable antithesis with “according to the flesh,” and thus sets his human nature in contradistinction to his divine. It is most in accordance with grammatical arrangement, as it makes ὁ ὧν, *who is*, in close connection with the immediately preceding antecedent, Christ. Secondly, it is required by the invariable position of the epithet *blessed* when it occurs in doxologies, unless the verb *εἰμί* or *γίνομαι* be expressed. As the cases are very nu-

	the flesh, Christ <i>came</i> , who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.
6 Οὐχ οἶον δέ, ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ · οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ.	Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel that are of Israel :

merous in the Old Testament and several are found in the New, it is surprising that Olshausen should regard this point as of little importance. In the Hebrew and Greek the expression is always the same, *εὐλογητός* or *עֲלֹהִים* never following the subject. The only seeming exception is Ps. lxxiii. (Sept. lxvii.) 20. There we have *Κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός*. But these words are immediately followed by the usual phraseology *εὐλογητὸς Κύριος*. The former is probably an interpolation, as there is nothing corresponding with it in the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, or Vulgate. If genuine, the different formula may have been added by the translator for the sake of emphasis. Such an exception can be of no weight against the general usage, particularly as, in this case, it is of such frequent occurrence. For the satisfaction of the reader, I refer him to the instances which occur in the New Testament : Luke i. 68, 2 Cor. i. 3, Eph. i. 3, 1 Pet. i. 3. To these the following may be added as somewhat analogous : *πιστὸς ὁ θεός* in 1 Cor. i. 9, 2 Cor. i. 18 ; and *δυνατὸς ὁ θεός* in 2 Cor. ix. 8. The Apostle's doxology is undoubtedly an ascription of eternal glory to Christ as truly God.

6-9. "Not as though," or 'as that : ' The critics have found some difficulty in analysing and settling the meaning of this phrase. Tholuck has discussed it at length. It is probably elliptical, meaning, 'but (it is) not so as that ; ' or, as Dr. Robinson expresses it, "but not so (would I reason) as that" &c. See his Lexicon under *οἶος* 3. The expression *ὥς ὅτι* in 2 Cor. xi. 21, and 2 Thess. ii. 2, translated "as though, as that," may be regarded as similar.—"The word of God : " This phrase expresses the divine threats or promises or both, as the context may require. Here God's promises, and especially those relating to the Messiah, are meant. The unhappy spiritual condition of the Jewish people in consequence of their rejection of the Messiah, is no proof that God's promises have failed. In the latter part of the verse the word Israel is used in the original first for the patriarch himself, and the phrase "they who are of Israel" for his lineal descendants. But afterwards it has a spiritual signification. In 1 Cor. x. 18, the merely natural descendants are called "Israel according to the flesh." All these are not true Israelites ; that is, they are not really what the honourable title implies ; not such as their great ancestor was, who prevailed with God and received his blessing. In other words, all Jacob's lineal descendants are not his spiritual children. Compare ii. 28, 29, where the rightful claim to the honour of being a Jew is limited to the inwardly religious Hebrew. The Apostle's meaning is shown by the very nature of the case, as

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 7 | neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, <i>are they</i> all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. | οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσὶ σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, 7
πάντες τέκνα, ἀλλ' ἐν Ἰσαὰκ
κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα. Τοῦτ' 8 |
| 8 | That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these <i>are</i> not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. | ἔστιν, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός,
ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ· ἀλλὰ
τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζ-
εται εἰς σπέρμα. Ἐπαγγελίας 9 |
| 9 | For this <i>is</i> the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah | γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος· κατὰ τὸν
καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐλεύσομαι καὶ |

is also that of our Lord in Matt. viii. 22, "let the dead bury their own dead." Tholuck quotes a remarkably apposite passage from a work of Abarbanel: "The disciple whose morals are corrupt, although he may belong to the children of Israel, is nevertheless not of the number of Abraham's disciples, because he does not imitate the morals of Abraham." This is the very idea which the Apostle expresses in the next clause. Not all the lineal descendants of the distinguished patriarch are truly his children; such honour is not a necessary consequence of the connection. This is implied by the words quoted from Genesis xxi. 12, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." St. Paul plainly intimates that the fact of God's limiting the favoured progeny to those that sprang from Isaac in contradistinction to Abraham's other descendants, and especially those through Ishmael, conveys this important truth. He takes the historical language in its religious and spiritual meaning.

"The children of the flesh" and "the children of the Spirit," are phrases founded on the birth of Ishmael according to the ordinary course of nature, and that of Isaac in an extraordinary way and in consequence of God's particular promise. Thus, in the parallel place in Galatians, the same language is used respecting the birth of the two children, and the phrase "by promise" first applied to Isaac is afterwards commuted for "after the Spirit," meaning in an extraordinary way: See iv. 23, 29. The quotation is from Gen. xviii. 10, which is rendered in our translation, "according to the time of life," but means, most probably, 'when the time lives (again,)' that is, about this time next year.*—The expression, "that is," in ver. 8, must not be regarded as a mere formula introducing an accommodated sense, as in x. 7, 8. The original limitation of the divine declaration to Isaac and his offspring implies the meaning here given, namely, that "the seed," the progeny really intended, are God's own children, spiritually born by virtue of his especial promise. This deeper spiritual signification of the terms is quite in accordance with other places. Thus, in iv. 16, 18, the promises to Abraham of numerous posterity are said to be verified in part by the union of faithful Gentiles in the church of Christ, and in ix. 27, the

* See note 80 in my Companion to Genesis, p. 263.

- 10 ἔσται τῇ Σάρρᾳ υἱός. Οὐ μόνον shall have a son. And not only 10
 δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ῥεβέκκα ἐξ ἐνός this; but when Rebecca also had
 κοίτην ἔχουσα Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πα- conceived by one, *even* by our father
 11 τρός ἡμῶν· μήπω γὰρ γεννη- Isaac; (for *the children* being not yet 11
 θέντων μηδὲ πραξάντων τι ἀγα- born, neither having done any good
 θὸν ἢ κακόν, ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν or evil, that the purpose of God, ac-
 πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένη, οὐκ ἐξ cording to election might stand, not
 ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος, of works, but of him that calleth;)
 12 ἐρρήθη αὐτῇ· ὅτι ὁ μείζων δου- it was said unto her, The elder shall 12

promise that a remnant of the nation should escape excision, is extended so as to embrace the salvation of believing Jews. See also Gal. iv. 21 et seq., where the historical narrative is represented as symbolizing very important truths.

10-13. Literally this portion begins thus: 'And not only, but also Rebecca, having conceived' &c. The ellipsis, which every reader perceives, must be supplied so as to convey the idea that not only was this so in the case of Sarah, but also in that of Rebecca; and this instance is adduced in confirmation of what had just been said. Perhaps the Apostle was induced thus to establish his statement, in order to meet some flimsy objection which might be urged on the ground that Ishmael was not the son of Abraham's wife, but of his Egyptian servant. Nothing of the sort could be alleged in this case, as Rebecca was Isaac's only wife, and the honourable mother of both the children, who moreover were twins. The very remarkable expression "of one," which would seem to be quite superfluous, not to say unexpected and strange, is best accounted for on this supposition.

"The purpose of God according to election" or his choice, may relate to that general purpose of his which has already been spoken of on viii. 28. But, most probably it is limited to the divine intention of electing or choosing the posterity of the one brother to the blessings of a covenant relationship with himself, in preference to the posterity of the other; regarded, however, as an essential part of that general purpose. This intention, as the Apostle says, was not founded on the works, that is, the character of the individuals; for they had not been born, and consequently had done nothing to establish such character. It resulted simply from the will of him who calleth, in other words, of God. The thought of God's plan and course of action being formed by any reference to foreseen character in man does not seem to have been in the Apostle's mind. It is hardly necessary to say that God's will must be consistent with his own benevolent character. Nevertheless, his will is the ultimate arbiter of all things.

"The elder shall serve the younger:" Gen. xxv. 23. A slight attention to the account in Genesis which is here referred to is sufficient to show,

- 13 serve the younger: as it is written, *λεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι, καθὼς γέ-* 13
 Jacob have I loved, but Esau have *γραφται· τὸν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα,*
 I hated. *τὸν δὲ Ἡσαῦ ἐμίσησα.*
- 14 What shall we say then? *Is* *τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἀδικία* 14
there unrighteousness with God?

that neither the sacred historian nor the inspired Apostle has in view the persons Jacob and Esau. It is undeniable that communities, in other words, their descendants, are meant. The divine declaration is expressly said to relate to "two nations and two manner of people; one people shall be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger." As regards the individuals, the prediction was not verified. Jacob was never the superior of his brother; on the contrary he constantly recognised Esau as his chief, and called him his lord. This is denied by Mr. Haldane on this text. He maintains that the subjection of Esau to Jacob was "personal." His first proof is, the transfer of the birthright. But this was nothing more than the voluntary relinquishment of a claim. His second, that "Esau was compelled to leave that land and to yield to Jacob." This statement he founds on Gen. xxxvi. 6. But the text merely states that Esau, finding his own possessions and those of his brother too large to admit of their remaining together, amicably removed elsewhere, and thus accommodated Jacob. He probably went to Mount Seir, where his brother had promised to follow him. See xxxiii. 14. In this particular, Esau seems to have imitated the conduct of his grandfather Abraham. See xiii. 5-12. It will be difficult to see in these statements any evidence of personal "subserviency" to Jacob. But the Edomites who descended from Esau were habitually held in subjection by the Israelites, and thus the prophecy was accomplished.—"As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated:" The quotation is from Mal. i. 3. The expression *to hate*, especially when placed antithetically, as here, to *love*, often denotes merely a less degree of affection and regard than is cherished for the other object. See Luke xiv. 26, where "hating" one's nearest relations and one's own life is put in connection with coming to Christ. Comp. also John xii. 25. In Gen. xxix. 31, it is said that "Leah was hated," while the same thought is expressed in the verse preceding, by the words, "he loved Rachel more than Leah." Olshausen here remarks that such considerations "cannot satisfy the conscientious expositor, since he cannot overlook the fact that St. Paul has advisedly selected a very strong and repulsive expression from the passage in question. Nor does it make against this, that in the passage of Malachi the immediate question is of outward circumstances, since these also are to be viewed as expressions of the wrath of God." Admitting all this to be true, we are still driven back to the inquiry, what is the meaning of God's being said *to hate*? The feeling implied in the

<p>15 παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ; μὴ γένοιτο. Τῷ γὰρ Μωϋσῇ λέγει · ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκ-</p>	<p>God forbid. For he saith to Moses, 15 I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have com- passion on whom I will have com-</p>
---	--

word when used by man in his present moral state is out of the question. The language can be nothing else than an accommodation to human weakness. It can mean nothing beyond this: 'to act towards with seeming harshness.' To determine precisely the point in the line of conduct from which love would practically show itself on the one side and the opposite element on the other, would be difficult if not impossible. Hence it is that according to Hebrew phraseology, which is often most accurately philosophical, a comparatively slight degree of the one is expressed by language which may also be applied to a slight degree of the other. It may be admitted that "St. Paul has advisedly selected a very strong and repulsive expression." Still, it is selected for no other purpose than to mark the more clearly God's particular favour towards his chosen. It does not come within the scope of the Apostle's purpose to speak of the future state of Isaac and Jacob as one of happiness, or that of Ishmael and Esau as one of misery. He merely intends to illustrate this point: that, as in reference to the patriarchal dispensation, God acted according to his purpose, and selected some in preference to others; so now in the Gospel dispensation or kingdom of the Messiah, he acts on the same principle, and admits to all the privileges of this kingdom some Jews, while he excludes therefrom the others. The character and conduct of God are shown to be invariably the same.

14-16. From what the Apostle has said, his Jewish readers could not but infer, that there must be a principle of faith to constitute any the true Israelites, the spiritual seed of Abraham; and that the rejection of unbelieving Jews from being a portion of God's covenant people, was in accordance with his past dealings with their ancestors, and not surprising or extraordinary in itself, however shocking it might be to their prejudices.— "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?" Shall we accuse God of injustice because he did not comprehend the posterity of Ishmael and Esau among his covenant people, and has rejected the present body of unbelieving Jews? Certainly not. Comp. iii. 6. Whether this verse is intended to express a Jewish objection, or is merely the author's oratorical mode of carrying on the argument, is uncertain, and has no bearing on the general train of thought.

"He saith to Moses," &c. The common reading is Μωσῇ, but most critics prefer Μωϋσῇ, which is supported by very excellent authority. The former reading is nearer to the form of the Hebrew name, and its really Hebrew origin. Pharaoh's daughter calls the child whom she had rescued from a watery grave, Moses, מֹשֶׁה, literally *drawing*, (the word is the present

16 passion. So then *it is* not of him *τείρω*. Ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλον- 16
 that willeth, nor of him that run- *τος, οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ*
 neth, but of God that showeth *τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος θεοῦ*. Λέγει γὰρ 17
 17 mercy. For the Scripture saith

participle,) because, says she, מִן־הַמַּיִם, "*I drew him out of the water.*" Exod. ii. 10. According to the Egyptian or Coptic, μῶ means *water* and ὑσῆς *saved*; and, in all probability, that led the Alexandrine translators of the Septuagint to adopt this form of the word, which so fitly expresses the fact. Still, it will not follow that the original name of Moses was of Egyptian origin; as the narrative in Exodus proves either that the princess adopted the language of the Hebrews in applying the name to a Hebrew child, or that the author of the account expressed in Hebrew what she had before said in her own dialect.*

"For:" The thought which the following words are intended to impress and in reference to which the particle is illative, appears to be this: 'In the distribution of his favours God acts according to his own pleasure.' In ver. 16 this thought is plainly expressed; and to establish and illustrate it is the principal object of the immediately following verses. The omission of the prominent idea, when it is clearly implied in the context, is not at all unusual. In Luke xi. 47, the leading thought and the ground of our Lord's denunciations is the hypocrisy of those whom he addresses, not the rebuilding and ornamenting of the prophets' tombs; so that various forced meanings and constructions which certain commentators have invented to remove a difficulty which in reality does not exist, are unnecessary. Compare Virgil, *Æn.* ii. 428, *Dis aliter visum*, on which see the commentators. Keeping in mind this implied idea, it is as if the Apostle had said: 'This view which I am giving need not surprise you; it is contained in several portions of Scripture, for instance in what God says to Moses in Exod. xxxiii. 19, 'I will show favour to whom I will show favour, and I will be benignant to whom I will be benignant.' The quotation occurs in connection with the narrative of the golden calf, and the intercession of Moses for the idolatrous Israelites.—Locke, and after him Macknight, explain "willeth" and "runneth" of Isaac's *desire* to bless Esau, and of Esau's *running* to procure agreeable food for his father. But this is fanciful; and if the Apostle had intended such an allusion, he would most likely have chosen a word expressive of *hunting*. *Running* implies earnest effort, as the word is used in Gal. ii. 2: "lest I should run or had run in vain." The meaning is simply this: 'the favours in contemplation do not depend on human inclination and effort, but on God's goodness and mercy.'

17, 18. The case of Pharaoh stands in contradistinction to that of Moses

* See Jablonski's *Voces Ægyptiacæ apud Scriptores veteres*, in his *Opuscula*, Edit. Te Water, Lugd. Bat. 1804, Tom. i. p. 152 et seq.

ἡ γραφή τῷ Φαραώ· ὅτι εἰς αὐτὸ unto Pharaoh, Even for this same
τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδεί- purpose have I raised thee up, that

introduced in ver. 15 by the same particle for. Both are stated in order to illustrate the principle which the Apostle was establishing, namely, that God acts according to his own good pleasure. This is the leading idea.—“The Scripture saith unto Pharaoh:” That is, it contains what God said to him by Moses.

“Raised thee up:” ἐξήγειρά σε. See Exod. ix. 16, where the Hebrew has הִעֲמִידְתָּנִי, *I have made thee stand or continue*, and the Septuagint διετηρήθης *thou hast been preserved*. I shall state the most prominent interpretations.

1. Some explain it thus: ‘I have raised (brought) thee into being, given thee existence.’ But this involves doctrinal difficulties with which it is unnecessary to encumber oneself; especially as it is not pretended that the word demands such a meaning.

2. Others, adopting the same translation, “raised thee up,” explain the clause in reference to Pharaoh’s distinguished position: ‘I have raised thee to high eminence, allowed thee to become celebrated as the monarch of Egypt, to fill the throne of the most glorious of worldly kingdoms.’

3. Many have contended for the translation, “I have roused thee up:” that is, ‘I have excited thee.’ Some have developed their meaning with sufficient perspicuity, by adding to the words thus translated the explanatory clause, “that thou shouldst the more contumaciously resist;” meaning, of course, God: See the passages in Tholuck, and the remarks of Olshausen against the supralapsarian scheme on ver. 17, note on p. 333. The Greek has certainly this meaning both in classical writers and in the Septuagint. If it be admitted here, we must apply the usual principle that God is said to do what he allows to take place, and explain thus: ‘I have suffered thee to be roused to opposition against me, in order that I might use thy passions as an occasion of the display of my power.’ This view involves no doctrinal difficulty, and such rousing is in reality identical with God’s hardening Pharaoh’s heart. In each case it is simply permissive. Neither is the objection urged by Tholuck of much weight, that we might rather have expected ἐπώτρυννα, or, what afterwards occurs, ἐσκλήρυννα. His other, that the words *against me* would have been added, is of more importance.

4. The only other meaning of the word which I shall mention, and endeavour also to establish as the most probable, is that which is conveyed, though not with sufficient precision and fulness, by the Septuagint translation. It cannot be thought the Apostle substitutes the more accurate ἐξήγειρά σε for διετηρήθης, without some sufficient reason. We must believe it to have been designedly done, in order to call the reader’s attention not merely to the fact of Pharaoh’s conservation, which the Septuagint states •

I might show my power in thee, ξῶμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δυνάμιν μου
 and that my name might be de- καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄνομά
 clared throughout all the earth. μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ. "Αρα οὖν 18
 18 Therefore hath he mercy on whom ὃν θέλει, ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει,
 he will *have mercy*, and whom he

but of its having been the result of causes operating in direct accordance with the divine will, thus showing why God preserved him. By changing the word he intimates that Pharaoh had been an instrument in the hand of God. The Greek translator rather gives the general sense than an accurate version of the original. Still, the point of the quotation is evidently this, that Pharaoh's life had been prolonged, and that thus his conduct had become the occasion of carrying the divine purpose into effect. The declaration is made by Moses after Pharaoh and the Egyptians had been greatly afflicted by former plagues. A slight attention to the connection in which it stands will illustrate the meaning. After the usual command to let the people go, the address proceeds thus: 'I could at this time send all my plagues, &c.; I could now stretch out my hand that I might smite thee and thy people with pestilence, and thou shouldst be cut off from the earth. But in very deed for this have I caused (or permitted) thee to continue, to show in thee my power,' &c. The Hebrew future is often used in this potential sense.* The same Hebrew word is used in Exod. xxi. 21, in reference to a servant *continuing* (to live) a short time; and the Greek ἐγερεῖ occurs in James v. 15, of *raising* up a sick man, in other words, causing him to continue in life. Pharaoh may well be regarded as brought low by the former plagues which had been inflicted on him and his people; and his being caused by God to continue, which is the exact sense of the Hebrew word, St. Paul may express by the Greek 'I have raised,' meaning 'kept thee up.'—The 18th verse contains the assertion before made put in the form of an inference: "Therefore" &c.

"He hardeneth, σκληρύνει. This word with ἀπό is used in the Septuagint, Job xxxix. 16, in the sense of *treateth harshly*. For this reason, and also because it makes a suitable antithesis with ἐλεεῖ, *he shows mercy to*, some critics have given the same meaning here, explaining thus: 'according to his pleasure, he is benignant to some, and to others severe.' But the narrative of Moses, and the general signification of the verb, are decisive in favour of the usual meaning "to harden," that is, 'to suffer to continue obstinate.' The form of expression respecting this subject varies. Sometimes God is represented as the agent in hardening; sometimes Pharaoh is said to harden himself; and sometimes the general statement is made, that his heart was hardened. See Exod. vii. 3, ix. 12, x. 1, 20, 27,

* See Conant's Translation of Roediger's Gesenius, Sect. 125, 3, d), Part III. p. 238, Appleton, N. Y. 1846.

<p>19 σκληρύνει. Ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι· τί ἐτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι 20 αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκε; Μενοῦνγε, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, σὺ τίς εἶ, ὁ ἀνταπο- κρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ</p>	<p>will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say 19 then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? for who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who 20 art thou that repliest against God?</p>
---	---

xi. 10, xiv. 4, 8, 17, viii. 15, 32, vii. 14, 22, viii. 19, ix. 7, 35. The first of these formulæ is the most frequent, probably in order to draw the reader's attention to the divine agency in allowing such a condition of mind to show itself. But it is evident that God's agency in such induration can be nothing more than permissive; it cannot militate against the free agency of the man. Olshausen rightly observes, that "this hardening is not the beginning of an evil state; it rather supposes this as being already begun. St. Paul does not say that God awakens the beginnings of evil in men. He considers these as already in being, first as a consequence of original sin, and then on account of man's own unfaithfulness, which does not suppress the already existing sinfulness, but only gives it sway."

19. This is generally regarded as an objection founded on the immediately preceding declaration, "whom he will he hardeneth." But, most probably, it is drawn from the whole doctrine which the Apostle has all along been establishing. The meaning seems to be as follows: 'If God is governed by a regard to his own plans, which human efforts cannot alter, and if he makes even human wickedness subserve those plans, why does he find fault with us, as our rejection of the Gospel promotes his purpose, (comp. iii. 5, 7,) which no one can effectually resist? If he shows favour to some and suffers us to remain obstinate, as you intimate, why does he blame us, since such is his will, which no created power can withstand?'

20-23. The objection above stated involves a censure of God for discontinuing to the Jews the religious privileges which they had so long enjoyed. St. Paul here replies to it. He begins by declaring the absurdity and wickedness of a creature's undertaking to censure the creator for not having made him a different sort of being from what he is, and illustrates his remark by the case of the potter moulding the clay. 'Admitting that God rejects the greater part of the Jewish nation, has he not as creator the right to place his creatures in whatever situation he chooses? What right have you, a weak man, to find fault with him for exercising his just and natural prerogative? As well might the thing made complain of its maker for not having formed it something else. God has plainly a right to put the being which his power has produced in any rank among his creatures, and to give it as many or as few advantages as he pleases.' Since therefore the Jews would have had no reason to complain if the Supreme Being had never granted them the peculiar benefits of his covenant; they surely could not reasonably object, if, for sufficient reasons

Shall the thing formed say to him πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με
 that formed it, Why hast thou made ἐποίησας οὕτως; Ἡ οὐκ ἔχει 21
 21 me thus? Hath not the potter power ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ,

and in order to promote most important purposes, he withdrew from them these benefits.

But this is merely a general answer. The Apostle proceeds to reply more particularly, and shows that the Jews have no reason to complain of their rejection, since God had treated them with the greatest indulgence. This is the full and proper and direct answer to the insolent objection. God has not confined his action to the exercise of his rights as Creator; he has shown his love, by bearing with the obdurate impenitent, as well as by extending his benevolence to others.

“Nay but,” *μενοῦνγε*. ‘Aye truly, rather indeed.’ The particle has a corrective force: You say, “why doth he find fault?” I reply, ‘rather, man, who are you that venture thus to bandy words with God?’ The Apostle intends to express the gross indecorum and wickedness of such a procedure.—“Power over the clay:” The Greek genitive is correctly thus translated. Comp. Matt. x. 1, “power over unclean spirits,” *πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων*. The illustration from the potter is similar to the passages in Isa. xxix. 16, xlv. 9, and especially Jer. xviii. 2–10.

The connection of vs. 22 and 23 has been variously represented by the commentators, to whom I must refer the critical reader. The first of the two verses may be an aposiopesis, that is, a suppression of the full sense, thus: ‘But if God, though intending to show his power, still bore with those men who were fitted for,’ or, ‘had fitted themselves for destruction; —.’ Similar to this we have in Exod. xxxii. 32, “yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sins—; and if not,” &c. Some regard the sentence as elliptical, and understand, *what shall we say then?* or, *why doth he yet find fault?* But, as Olshausen remarks, this is nothing but a repetition of the language of ver. 19. It would be vastly better to supply from the preceding verse, “hath he not power,” or ‘right,’ *ἐξουσίαν*;—“Vessels of wrath, vessels of mercy,” are figurative expressions, naturally arising from the image of the potter before employed, and denoting those persons who may be the subjects respectively of the divine benevolence or chastisement. That the one class may become the other, is certainly true, although this consideration has no bearing on the Apostle’s statement.—“Show his wrath:” Comp. i. 18, iii. 5.—“His power,” *δυνατόν* for *δύναμιν*, as in ver. 17. Comp. *γνωστόν* in i. 19.

Κατηρτισμένα simply expresses their condition, “fitted for.” How, or by whom, or under what circumstances, must be learned from the context and analogy of Scripture, both of which give the impression that this condition was produced by their own course of conduct. Professor Stuart

ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι over the clay, of the same lump to
 ὁ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος, ὃ δὲ εἰς make one vessel unto honour, and
 22 ἀτιμίαν; Εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς another unto dishonour? *What if* 22

thinks that the antithesis between this word and the phrase “whom he had before prepared,” proves that the condition of being fitted is ascribed to divine agency. There would be no difficulty in explaining the meaning and showing its accordance with other parts of Scripture, if it were certain that such is the sense. But this is not proved by the antithesis. For the Apostle may speak of God’s being the agent in preparing for glory, in order to keep up in the reader’s mind the necessity of the divine influence for good; while, at the same time, he may designedly employ an indefinite term in describing the moral condition of obdurate sinners. Professor Hodge judiciously observes, that “when speaking of the vessels of mercy, the active voice is used, as if *designedly to mark the difference between the two cases.*” To the same purpose Doddridge: “Every attentive reader will, I doubt not, infer for himself *the great difference of phrase* in which they who are vessels of wrath and they who are vessels of mercy are spoken of; it being said simply of the former, that they were *fitted for destruction*, but of the latter *that God prepared them for glory*: a distinction of so great importance that I heartily wish we may ever keep it in view.” Olshausen is of the same opinion. “Prepared before signifies God’s foreknowledge as well as his working and creation of the good, both in its commencement, continuation and end. But of the evil, on the other hand, Paul will not consent to say that God creates the evil in them, but only the form which the evil assumes. Therefore he does not use *prepared* of them; moreover instead of the active he uses the middle form, by which the production of evil itself is transferred to the side of the creature. The Apostle intended by this method to signify the different relation in which God stands to the good and the evil.” To which he adds that the other view is inconsistent with the expression, “endured with much long suffering.” “There is something not only discordant but absolutely contradictory in the idea that God thus endures what he has himself prepared.” As cases somewhat similar, I will remark that in the last verses of the 5th and 6th chapters, the Apostle adds to *life* the epithet *eternal*, although he omits it in reference to the contrasted word *death*.

“And that he might make known.” Tholuck examines various ways in which these words have been thought to be connected with the preceding. According to Stuart, *ἵνα γνωρίσῃ* is dependent on *θέλων*, and equivalent to the infinitive *γνωρίσαι* as expressed in ver. 22. As this construction presumes an ellipsis in ver. 23, he supplies it by introducing at the end “showed mercy.” The meaning thus elicited is quite in harmony with the context. I am disposed to believe, however, that the Apostle has

God, willing to show *his* wrath, and ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνω-
to make his power known, endured ρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ ἤνεγκεν

another thought in mind. "*Iva* may be ecbatic and the words be explained, 'and thus does he make known.' The following statement will assist the reader in perceiving and judging of the proposed meaning.

It appears from historical statements in the New Testament, that, in making known the Gospel to mankind, it was the divine purpose that it should first be promulgated to the Jews. This accords with our Lord's own practice, who spent a considerable portion of the first year of his ministry in Jerusalem and Judea; with his directions to his Apostles; and with their practice pursuant thereto. See John ii. 13—iv. 3, 45, Luke xxiv. 47, Acts i. 4, and other similar places. Multitudes of Jews did indeed receive the Gospel, but still the mass of the nation rejected it. It appears from the evangelical history so far as it is given in the Acts, that the Apostles first made the offer of the Gospel to the Hebrews, and on their rejection of it, proclaimed it freely to Gentiles; and, moreover, that its rejection by the former became the occasion of direct proclamation of it to the latter. See particularly Acts xiii. 46 et seq. It would seem that the Jewish prejudice which limited the blessings of Messiah's kingdom to their own nation, (a prejudice which maintained influence on the mind of the Apostle Peter even after the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and until it was removed by the vision of the great sheet,) was in a great degree dispelled by the fact that the Jews obstinately closed their eyes to the truth, while Gentiles "gladly received the word." Thus the rejection of the Gospel by the former led, in the providence of God, to its becoming known, appreciated, and obeyed by the latter: "To the Jew first and also to the Greek." Comp. Acts xi. 19–21. In Rom. xi. 11, 12, 15, 30, the admission of Gentiles to the benefits of Christ's religion, is represented as having taken place in consequence of its rejection by the Jews. Is it impossible that the Apostle may have been influenced by the same thought, when he wrote this passage? He does not indeed say in express terms that the Jews had rejected the Gospel; but his course of remark implies, and would suggest it to every reflecting reader. It seems to me probable, therefore, that this is what he means. If so, the words, "that he might make known" &c. will be connected with the idea so prominent in the preceding context, namely, the rejection of the mass of unbelieving Jews. The leading thought will then be as follows: God hath rejected the impenitent Jews, who by a long course of faithlessness had rendered themselves utterly unworthy of his continued favour, and *thus he has promulged* the abundance of his kindness to others. These indeed are represented as consisting of Jews as well as Gentiles; but it is evident that the latter constitute the predominant portion in the view of the Apostle.

ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction ;

Grotius on xi. 11, suggests a reason for a predominance of Gentile over Jewish converts being allowed to take place in the early Christian church. He says that if the Jews had obtained the ascendancy, they would have opposed the admission of the Gentiles into the church, unless they submitted to circumcision and the Mosaic law, and that this is evident from the feeling which prevailed so extensively on this subject among many influential Jewish converts. See Acts xv. 1 et seq. and xxi. 20 et seq. But since they were much the smaller body, they were not in a condition to impose laws on the others. And thus, he remarks, that God, by a wisdom truly admirable, brought light out of darkness. But this representation is quite uncertain. It is to be presumed that, if the Jewish converts had become more numerous than the Gentile, the same divine grace which enabled them to perceive and feel the truth of the Gospel, would also have imparted to them such knowledge of its spirituality, and such practical wisdom and charity towards all their converted brethren, as would have prevented such a result. Like Peter, the great body of them would have remitted their attachment to the external law, and liberated themselves from a system which he, who had been so long under complete subjection to it, declared to be "a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear:" Acts xv. 10.—"Riches of his glory," conveys the idea of the fulness and excellence of the divine favour, as before explained. Comp. Eph. i. 7, 18, ii. 7, Col. i. 27.

Προητοίμασε. "Afore prepared:" This, as Professor Hodge remarks, is "the common and proper meaning of the word." But what he adds in connection with this can by no means be admitted. "As to *prepare beforehand* and to *predestine* are very nearly related ideas, the word is also used in this latter sense. Eph. ii. 10, 'which God had before ordained that we should walk in them.' This meaning is commonly adopted here,* 'which God had fore-ordained unto glory;' see the parallel passage in Acts xiii. 48, 'as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.' The other signification of the word, however, gives a very good sense."—Certainly it does. It gives the only sense allowed by general usage. The word never occurs in the New Testament, except here, and in the place in Ephesians. In both it has the same meaning, and the correct translation of the latter is, 'that we should walk in which God hath before prepared.' Without the preposition the word occurs 40 times, and always in the sense of *preparing*, never of *destining*. Neither is it correct to say that "this meaning is commonly adopted here." Wiclif, Tyndale, Cranmer, the Genevan and Rheims translations all give the idea of preparation. Wahl does indeed

* See Wahl's Clavis on the word.

23 and that he might make known the καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον 23
riches of his glory on the vessels of τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέ-

give this sense, but he says nothing in defence of it. The place in Acts is not parallel, inasmuch as the word is different, and the meaning cannot be proved to be the same. Rosenmüller, in his Scholia on the New Testament, refers, for the same signification of predestinating, to Gen. xxiv. 14, and Matt. xxv. 34. But the references are unsatisfactory. In the first text, the English translation has, "thou hast appointed," and the Septuagint ἡτοιμάσας. In the Hebrew the word is הִתְכַּחֵשׁ, which, according to Jarchi, and the best Biblical scholars, means, *thou hast proved* or *given proof of*; that is, hast shown to be the damsel who is to become the wife of Isaac. In the second, the ordinary meaning of "*prepared* for you" is undoubtedly the true one, as in every other similar passage. And so it is in the verse under consideration. To "*prepare* before for glory" those on whom God intends to confer the full blessings of Messiah's kingdom, is the same thing as to make all necessary previous preparations for their future happiness. It is identical with the idea in Ephesians: 'God hath made all previous preparations that we should walk in good works.' The Vulgate in both places translates *præparavit*. Thus we read, that honours have "*been prepared* by the father," of a "*kingdom prepared*," of Christ's going "*to prepare* a place," of "*things prepared* for those who love God," and of his having "*prepared* for them a city." See note on Heb. ix. 23, p. 132. The inspired writers may speak of the preparation of the place or of the persons or of the arrangements necessary to the accomplishment of the divine scheme of salvation; yet the general thought is one and the same. God hath done the whole; the preparation for glory, as well as the plan whereby it becomes attainable, is all his own.

There is still another view which may be taken of this and similar passages; and probably it is best to comprehend it within that just stated. It is simply this, that as God is said to do what he determines, so he may here be represented as having *prepared* for salvation those whom he had *purposed* to save. But this will not affect the meaning of the word, which will still convey the idea of preparing those contemplated by the divine purpose.

Here it may be well to give a brief view of the leading train of thought from the 14th verse. 'From what has been said, can God be charged with injustice? Certainly not. But he acts according to his own pleasure, as he says, 'I will show favour and benignity to whomsoever I will.' His plans all originate from and are carried out in accordance with his own will, so that their direction and arrangement do not at all depend upon human inclination or effort, but solely on the divine wisdom and benevolence. And, to give an instance of a bad man being made subservient to

οὐς, ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν, mercy which he had afore prepared
 24 οὗς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς, οὐ μόνον unto glory, even us, whom he hath 24
 ἐξ Ἰουδαίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν, called not of the Jews only, but also
 25 ὥς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει· κα- of the Gentiles? As he saith also in 25
 λέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου, Hosea, I will call them my people,
 καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγα- which were not my people; and her
 26 πημένην· καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, beloved, which was not beloved.
 οὐ ἐρρήθη αὐτοῖς· οὐ λαός μου And it shall come to pass, *that* in 26

the divine plans, it is said of Pharaoh, that God had allowed him to continue in order to display his power through the monarch's obduracy, and thus to spread his glory in the world. It is plain, therefore, that God so disposes all things as to promote his own purposes, extending his benefits to some, and suffering others to continue obdurate. Will you object that, since God's plans cannot be altered by man's efforts, no blame ought to be found with your conduct, because it subserves those plans? I reply, first, that this is presumptuous and insolent in so uninformed a creature, and that the maker of all things has unquestionably a right to dispose of his favours as he pleases, granting to one portion of mankind a greater and to another a less degree of benefit. And, secondly, to speak plainly in reference to the rejection of unbelieving Jews as God's covenant people, if God hath borne patiently with you although you have merited condemnation, will you be querulous against what should excite your gratitude? In consequence of your obstinate rejection of his son, he withdraws from you the blessings of this covenant relation, and bestows them on the Gentiles with a view to the ultimate salvation of all, whether Jews or Gentiles, who may accept the proffered mercy, and for whose happiness he hath fully provided.'

24-26. Here the Apostle plainly states whom he means by the figurative phrase, "vessels of mercy;" namely, Jewish and Gentile Christians, applying the passages from Hosea to the latter class. The masculine οὗς refers to ἡμᾶς, *us*, which expresses the meaning of the neuter antecedent σκεύη, *vessels*, that is, the persons so designated. The quotations are from i. 10, and ii. 23; or, according to the Hebrew notation, ii. 1, 25. The prophet is certainly speaking of the restoration of the Israelites to divine favour, and there is no reason to suppose that St. Paul either understood or intended to expound his meaning otherwise. The prophecy relates to the ten tribes, whose idolatry and wickedness are described under the image of a faithless wife and abandoned children, who are disgraced and punished by the indignant husband and father, but after a long period of penal discipline, are at length readmitted to favour.*—The feminine, "*her*

* The reader may find an exposition of the first chapter of Hosea, as given in the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel, and in the Commentary of David Kimchi, in my Jewish Rabbies, p. 165 et seq.

the place where it was said unto them, Ye <i>are</i> not my people; there shall they be called the children of 27 the living God. Esaias also crieth concerning Israel, Though the num-	ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος. Ἡσαίας δὲ κράζει 27 ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ· ἐὰν ᾗ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ κατὰ-
---	--

beloved," refers to the fact, that the prophet describes the once rejected but now restored people under the symbol of his *daughter*, named *Lo-ruhamah*, that is, *not beloved*.—"In the place:" This does not mean 'instead of;' it marks locality. This is proved from the adverb that follows, "there;" and thus we have the same language, both in the Hebrew and Septuagint, in 1 Kings xxi. 19: "*In the place where* dogs licked the blood of Naboth, *there* shall dogs lick thy blood." The prophet undoubtedly means, that *in whatever countries* the scattered Israelites may be dispersed, *there* shall they, on their conversion, be recognised as God's people.—The language of God to the favoured Israelites by which the renewal of his love is expressed, is here applied to the Gentiles, who had so long "been alienated from the life of God by wicked works," (Eph. iv. 18, Col. i. 21,) but were now by the Gospel brought into his family and blessed with his returned affection.

27-29. "Crieth:" That is proclaimeth openly. The same word is thus used in John vii. 28, xii. 44.—ὑπὲρ has the meaning of *περί*, *concerning*, as in 2 Cor. vii. 4, and elsewhere.—The prophet's declaration, as cited in ver. 27, is evidently to this effect: 'however numerous may be the body of the Jewish people, yet the remnant (only) shall be saved.' Τὸ κατὰλειμμα is undoubtedly emphatic. It refers to the divine promise, repeatedly alluded to by Isaiah, that, although the nation might be exposed to various attacks and even excisions, yet their enemies should not entirely triumph; there should still be a reserved portion, a remnant of the people, in accordance with the divine promise made to the prophet when called to his mission among his countrymen. Notwithstanding the *wasting*, and the *desolation* and the *removal* and the *forsaking*, "a tenth shall return, the holy seed:" vi. 11-13. This promise is, as I have said, several times referred to. The very name of one of Isaiah's sons, *Shear-jashub*, that is, *a remnant shall return*, was given him evidently in order to keep up in the mind of the people this promise, and thus to strengthen their faith in it. This accounts for the fact that the prophet is directed to take this son with him when he goes "to meet Ahaz:" vii. 3. Now, although the preservation of this remnant, and its restoration after temporal and political dangers, are announced by Isaiah, it is by no means necessary to limit his prediction to merely civil occurrences and immunity from national evils. The Apostle applies the promise more generally. He shows that it comprehends a reference to the faithful part of the Israelites, the deliverance or salvation secured to them being spiritual and heavenly, and by the instrumentality

28 λειμμα σωθήσεται. Λόγον γὰρ
 συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δι-
 καιοσύνῃ· ὅτι λόγον συντετμη-
 μένον ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ber of the children of Israel be as
 the sand of the sea, a remnant
 shall be saved. For he will finish
 the work, and cut it short in right-
 ousness; because a short work will

of true religious faith. And there is no occasion to suppose that he accommodates the language of the prophet to his own immediate purposes. He does but develop its full meaning. That the politically saved remnant was a symbol of those religiously saved, is a view which entirely harmonizes with the general analogy of prophecy, especially that of Isaiah; and it seems to be intended by the words, "The remnant of Jacob shall return *unto the mighty God*:" x. 21. The last clause expresses a religious conversion.

The quotation in ver. 29 from Isaiah i. 9, is explicable on the same principle. The prophet, most probably, speaks of the preservation of Judah from utter ruin, threatened by some very sanguinary attacks of their enemies. To what particular slaughter he refers, it is difficult to say. Bishop Lowth inclines to the opinion that some invasions made by Resin and Pekah "at the latter end of Jotham's reign, are referred to in this prophecy." See his note on vs. 7-9. Rosenmüller, on ver. 7, remarks, that "some consider the language as descriptive of those miserable times during the reign of Ahaz, when not only the Israelites under Pekah, but the Syrians also from the north, the Edomites from the south, and the Philistines from the west, invaded Judea, ruining the country, seizing the cities, and capturing thousands. See 2 Chron. xxviii. 5-19." He objects to this view, however, on account of the order in which the prophecies are arranged, and thinks that what is here said relates to the state of things under Uzziah, after Amaziah had been conquered by Joash, King of Israel, his people terribly slaughtered, his country and capital laid waste, and even the walls of Jerusalem in a great measure destroyed. See 2 Kings xiv. 8-14, 2 Chron. xxv. 14-24. The prophet may have his mind on these eruptions, and also on the devastations which were caused by the Assyrian invasions, of which we have so graphical and poetic a description in Isa. vii. 18-25, viii. 21, 22, and x. 6. This representation of the wretched condition of the people, the Apostle applies to the spiritual state of the Israelites, rejected by God with the exception of the chosen and choice remnant.

This comprehensive view of Isaiah's language accords with the application of the prediction in Genesis relating to the vast number of Abraham's progeny, which is made by the Apostle in iv. 16; where see the note, p. 69.

The 28th verse remains to be considered: "For he will finish the work" &c. The word rendered "work" is *λόγον* in both places, and there

the Lord make upon the earth. 29 And as Esaias said before, Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodom, and been made like unto Gomorrah.	Καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας · 29 εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὥς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγεν- ῆθημεν καὶ ὥς Γόμορρά ἂν ὠμοιώθημεν.
--	---

is no propriety in giving it this meaning, which is not sustained by Greek usage. Neither is there any necessity for translating it *thing*, although this would make a good sense. Its usual signification of *declaration*, *expressed determination*, affords a very suitable meaning. *Συντέμνων*, which properly means “cutting together, contracting by cutting,”* is explained by some in the sense of *lessening*, *shortening*; by others in that of *decreeing*, *determining*. Tholuck prefers the meaning of *accelerating*, *hastening*, according to the idea, so common in the Old Testament, of God’s punishments *quickly* overtaking the impenitent sinner. Thus the whole verse will convey the thought that, in his righteous indignation, God is quickly completing his announced determination, for he will make his determination (to be) quickly executed in the earth (or, the land.)

The words in Isa. x. 22, latter half, and 23, here quoted, are explained by the great mass of commentators, as referring to the overwhelming destructions which God had determined to bring upon the Jews and Israelites. And certainly this view of them agrees with the former half of ver. 22, “though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return,” and also with their apparent application by the Apostle. Still, it would seem that the prophet has in view the immediate overthrow of the Assyrian forces, and the very extraordinary destruction which swept off multitudes of them in one night: See 2 Kings xix. 35, or Isa. xxxvii. 36. The section begins with the 5th verse. The prophet describes the infidel insolence of this haughty power, that regards itself as independent, and threatens excision to the people of Jehovah. He speaks of it as the feeble and passive instrument in the hand of the Almighty workman, and threatens it with deserved punishment under the figure of the conflagration of a forest: 5–19. Then follows the effect of this divine judgment on the character of those of the Israelites who had escaped former attacks; they shall turn from those human helps which, instead of benefiting, had injured them, and shall trust in the only defence, their own true God. To him they shall return by penitence and faith. Numerous though they may have been and may even continue hereafter to be, yet the remnant only shall return. While the prophet does indeed limit this promise to the remnant, yet it is quite certain that a very prominent thought in his mind is, that *they shall most certainly return*. It would therefore, be very natural for him to connect immediately with this promise a declaration, that

* Robinson’s Lexicon.

30 Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὅτι ἔθνη τὰ μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην κατέ- What shall we say then? That 30 the Gentiles, which followed not

God's purpose to "consume" the hostile Assyrians should be completely effected. And this is what he seems to say: 20-23. With this view of the passage the verses that follow entirely coincide, and it removes all difficulty in the word "therefore," with which they begin. Some commentators take no notice of this particle; others give it the meaning of *nevertheless, yet*; others again, retaining the usual sense *therefore*, suppose it to relate to the 19th and previous verses. But, if "the consumption" spoken of in vs. 22, 23, refer to the Assyrian overthrow, the connection of the discourse is self-evident, and the prophet's language perfectly accurate. Having threatened to consume the Assyrian forces, God calls upon his people not to fear them. The chapter concludes by a graphical description of their rapid march towards Jerusalem, and of their sudden and unexpected destruction. The mighty Oriental power is depicted under the figure of a noble forest exposed to the axe of the destroyer: 'Behold the Lord, Jehovah of hosts, lops off the bough with a crash, and the lofty ones are cut down, and the haughty shall be humbled. And he will cut down the thickets of the forest, and that Lebanon shall fall:' 24-34.

In confirmation of this view of the passage in Isaiah, it may further be remarked that the words employed by the prophet seem to refer back to what he had before said respecting the destruction of the Assyrians. "*The consumption*," בְּלִירָו, and "*a consumption*," בְּלָה, in vs. 22, 23, are a repetition of what had been stated in ver. 18, "*he shall consume*," יִבְלֶה. This shows the unity of subject throughout.

If this view be correct, the inquiry arises, how does the Apostle apply the words of the prophet? This question admits of two answers. It may be said that, as his leading thought is the salvation of the remnant, that is, the faithful Israelites, he introduces the words in ver. 28 merely on account of their connection in Isaiah with the main statement; or, that language by which the prophet announces the destruction of the Assyrians the Apostle applies to the spiritual overthrow of the unbelieving Israelites. In other words, he expresses his own thought in the prophet's words. See remarks on quotations in the Commentary on Hebrews, pp. 26 et seq.

30, 31. Olshausen seems to regard the whole of vs. 30, 31, as the question, and to make the answer follow "wherefore," διατί, in ver. 32. In this case ὅτι would mean *inasmuch as, since*, as in John ii. 18 and ix. 17; and the sense would be thus: 'What shall we say then, since Gentiles &c., but Israel &c.? Wherefore is it thus?' The reason follows in ver 32: 'Because' &c. But the usual arrangement is preferable. What shall we say then? what conclusion shall we come to? The answer which imme-

after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the right- 31 eousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained 32 to the law of righteousness. Where-	λαβε δικαιοσύνην, δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως, Ἰσραὴλ δὲ δι- 31 ὥκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης εἰς νόμ- ον δικαιοσύνης οὐκ ἔφθασε. Διὰ τί ; ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὡς 32
--	--

diately follows states the only legitimate one. Therefore, no exposition of the preceding portion of the chapter can possibly be the true one, which does not accord with and make prominent the thought so clearly announced by the Apostle, namely, that Gentiles have obtained what Israelites failed to secure, that is, justification. Here the scope of the writer is ascertained by his own express statement, and no rule of interpretation can possibly be more certain.

In speaking of the Gentiles as not "following after," or aiming at, justification, the Apostle does not mean to represent them as negligent and careless concerning acceptance with God, when this blessing was offered them. Undoubtedly those among them who "attained unto justification," had become interested in the Gospel; and this is most expressly stated respecting those who are mentioned in Acts xiii. 46-48. St. Paul refers to their former irreligious condition, when living without God in the world. And in the same way he describes them in x. 20, as those who had neither sought nor inquired after God. On the Gospel being made known to them, they embraced its offers and secured its benefits. But this was not the case with the Israelites. They followed *νόμον δικαιοσύνης* literally, a law of justification, but according to an idiom, very common in Hebrew and also in other languages, a justifying law; but they did not reach it. They clung tenaciously to an ideal system of their own, and therefore failed to secure the vainly hoped for benefit.* But such a system is chimerical, and cannot possibly, in the present condition of fallen human nature, have any real existence. In this way does St. Paul speak in Phil. iii. 9, of his "own justification which is of the law;" meaning a hypothetical or ideal one, a justification which he once supposed himself to have secured.

32, 33. The ellipsis to be supplied, is suggested by the preceding verse: 'they did not aim at it, seek it by.'—'Ως. This particle, as employed here and in John i. 14, is thought by many able critics to be equivalent to the Hebrew *caph*, asseverating, or definitely marking out the thing or person intended to be expressed. See Neh. vii. 2, where the particle *caph* in the

* After writing as above, I see that Tholuck has given, not only the same general view but even the same word. The reader will perhaps allow that the coincidence favours the exposition. After stating various views of earlier writers, (which I did not think it expedient to introduce,) such as a hypallage of *law of justification* for *justification by law*, and others of the same sort; he prefers explaining *law of justification* "von einem *idealem* vorgestelltem Gesetz oder einer Norm, durch welche man Gerechtigkeit erlangen kann."

ἐξ ἔργων νόμου · προσέκοψαν γὰρ fore? Because *they sought it not*
 33 τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος, κα- by faith, but as it were by the
 θὼς γέγραπται · ἰδοὺ, τίθημι ἐν works of the law: for they stum-
 bled at that stumbling-stone; as it 33

Hebrew כְּאִישׁ אֱמֶת, is omitted in our translation, “he was a faithful man,” whereas the true meaning is, ‘he was how faithful a man;’ that is really so, one whose fidelity was indubitable. Thus the meaning will be equivalent to indeed, really. They sought it not of faith, but indeed of the works of the law. John i. 14 is cited in confirmation of the same meaning. In both cases, however, a slight ellipsis removes the difficulty, while the particle retains its ordinary signification. In St. John the meaning probably is, ‘such glory as belongs to the only begotten, and might be expected to be manifested by him;’ and here, ‘but (as I may well say,) by the deeds of the law.’ Comp. Phil. 14.

The quotation is principally from Isa. xxviii. 16, although the Apostle introduces also certain words from other places, alluding to Isa. viii. 14, and perhaps to Ps. cxviii. 22. By the stone laid in Zion he means the Messiah; and, while he thus figuratively represents him as the support of his church and of every individual member thereof, he suggests that he may become an occasion of injury and ruin to those who reject him. In exactly the same way does Isaiah speak of “the Lord of hosts” being “a sanctuary” for some, and “a stone of stumbling” &c. for others. Such a combination of the words of one or more passages of the Old Testament is not uncommon. See the remarks on quotations in the Commentary on Hebrews, p. 21, and the work of Surenhusius, before mentioned, Lib. ii. Thesis vii. pp. 45–47. Although it be granted, which indeed is most probable, that in Isa. viii. 13, 14, the divine Messiah is the object referred to; yet it will not follow that he is introduced as the speaker in vs. 16–18: a theory which seems to have originated in an endeavour to reconcile the language of the prophet with its application in Heb. ii. 13. In the 118th Psalm the rejected stone is immediately David, but ultimately Christ. In Isa. xxviii. 16, the “foundation” is certainly the Messiah. This is allowed by Jarchi and some other Jewish authorities, although Aben Ezra and David Kimchi explain it of Hezekiah. It is usual with the prophets to introduce the Messiah or to describe the blessings of his government and period in contrast with evils, political or moral or both, which prevailed in their own times; and therefore such a view of this passage harmonizes with their manner. In opposition to every deceitful pretended refuge and support, God himself represents the Messiah whom he is about to send as the true and solid foundation which shall never be shaken. He sustains all who trust him. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 6. In this way the promise of Immanuel, the miraculously born Messiah, is made, in

is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stumbling-stone and rock of offence; and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.

Σιὼν λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου, καὶ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται.

X. Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that

Ἀδελφοί, ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς Χ. ἐμῆς καρδίας καὶ ἡ δέησις ἡ πρὸς

direct contrast to the irreligious and infidel rejection of a divine attestation by Ahaz.

“Stumbling-stone and rock of offence:” That is a stone or rock over or against which one may stumble, or dash himself. The expressions are figurative, like “gin, snare, trap,” for whatever or whosoever may become the cause or occasion of injury.

“Shall not be ashamed:” In the Old Testament it is, “shall not make haste.” This is the usual meaning of the Hebrew word שָׁחַח, and the idea conveyed by it seems to be this: ‘shall not hurry away,’ as one would who had no confidence in the strength of his defence or what he had relied on. Thus it expresses the idea of permanent and steady trust, in opposition to flight impelled by doubtfulness and fear. It is not surprising therefore that in the Arabic the same verb is used in the three senses of *to hasten*, *to fear*, and *to be ashamed*, for in fact the ideas are naturally connected. The last, which is that of the Septuagint, is followed by St. Paul, both here and in x. 11; the Chaldee and Syriac prefer the second; and the first is adopted in our English translation of the prophet. The conjecture of Grotius, Hammond, and Bishop Lowth, that the Hebrew should be altered to שָׁחַח, like most other such conjectures, is both unsupported and unnecessary.

x. 1. “Israel:” The better reading is ‘them,’ αὐτῶν. As this verse is the commencement of an ancient lectionarium or Church lesson, the noun was probably substituted for the pronoun for the information of the congregation. We have a similar substitution in Acts iii. 11 of “the lame man who was healed” instead of ‘he.’ Sometimes these lectionaria contained introductory clauses preceding the words of Scripture, and perhaps this may have given rise to the admission of such clauses occasionally in the Gospel for the day in our Book of Common Prayer. See, for example, the Gospels for the fourth Sunday after Easter, for the sixth and ninth Sundays after Trinity, for St. Philip and St. James’ day, and that for All Saints’ day. In all these cases the introduction is quite unnecessary, to say the least, as no intelligent hearer can doubt that the speaker is Jesus.—“That they might be saved:” Literally, ‘for salvation.’ The meaning is, that they may be converted and enjoy the blessings of Messiah’s kingdom. Comp. xi. 26.

2. “I bear them record:” The original word sometimes expresses sim-

τὸν θεὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν [ἐστὶν] εἰς	they might be saved. For I bear	2
σωτηρίαν. Μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς,	them record, that they have a zeal	
ὅτι ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ	of God, but not according to know-	
κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. Ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ	ledge. For they, being ignorant of	3
τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ	God's righteousness, and going	
τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην ζητοῦντες	about to establish their own right-	

ply the idea of attesting, and sometimes the additional meaning of in opposition to, or in favour of. The last is here intended: 'I willingly bear testimony in their favour.' Thus the word is used in Luke iv. 22, Heb. xi. 39, and often elsewhere.—"Zeal of God:" Some regard this as a Hebraistic superlative for very great zeal, like mountains or cedars of God, that is very lofty ones. But the better meaning is 'zeal for God,' as the genitive is often used. Comp. John ii. 17, "zeal of (for) thine house."

3. "Ignorant:" The ignorance of the Jews respecting the spiritual nature of Messiah's kingdom was certainly a guilty ignorance, as they might and ought to have known better; but still it is not to be doubted, that the Apostle here uses the expression as somewhat apologetic. This is evident from the connection. And thus St. Peter tells the Jews, that he knew they had crucified the Messiah, without being aware of what they were doing: Acts iii. 17. St. Paul also speaks of his own persecuting course of conduct as carried on in ignorance: 1 Tim. i. 13, Acts xxvi. 9. The guilt of such actions is not done away, although it is somewhat modified.—"God's righteousness:" That is, God's plan of justification in opposition to a fancied one of their own.

4. "For" is illative and logically connected with what precedes. It is as if the Apostle had said, 'They are ignorant, for the law was not intended to justify.'—"The end:" Some explain the word thus: 'Christ is the completion, fulfilment of the law. In him it finds its full accomplishment. He kept it perfectly in all respects.' This is true; but it is not the natural sense of the expression, nor is the meaning very well adapted to the connection. To say that Christ fulfilled the law is too general a truth to be here introduced. And to represent the Apostle as stating, that Christ's actual fulfilling of the moral law is imputed or made over to the believer as the ground of his justification, is simply to assume a sense of the words which cannot be proved. According to others the Apostle merely says, that with Christ the law comes to its termination. He brings it to its end. This also is true, but the sense is not so important as the context seems to require. Besides, it may lead to a misapprehension of the true scriptural view of the doctrine of justification; and this misapprehension does, I think, appear in Koppe's note. He gives the general idea of the verse thus: 'the law having been abolished through Christ, we are all justified by faith;' and refers to Gal. iii. 24. As the general scope of the Apostle's

- eousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of
 4 God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one
 5 that believeth. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.
 6 But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? that is to bring
 στῆσαι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν. Τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου· ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτω λέγει· μὴ εἰπῆς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν· ἢ· τίς

representation in this and the next verses, he states as follows: 'While the authority of the Mosaic laws lasted, it was by a careful observance of them that men obtained salvation; but now, since the abrogation of those laws by Christ, the sole condition of salvation is this, to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God sent from heaven to earth, and that he was raised from the dead.' This view, which presumes that different ways of justification and acceptance with God have obtained under different dispensations and at different times, is directly at variance with the general tenour of Scripture, and particularly with the scope of this Epistle, which is intended to show that faith, and not observance of laws, has in all ages been the principle by which, to use the most expressive and appropriate language of Clement of Rome, "Almighty God has always justified man from the beginning of the world." Comp. iv. 3-8; also Heb. iv. 3, and the note there.

There is still another view of the Apostle's expression, which appears preferable to either; though it is possible that the idea of putting an end to the law may also be comprehended. 'Christ is the end or object or scope towards which the law tended.' The whole Mosaic institution, ceremonial and moral, referred to him as the one and only source of justification. It was intended to lead to him, and to prepare for his coming. See Gal. iii. 24. He has forever done away the law, so as to show that it neither was nor could be the means of a sinner's justification. This can be obtained in no other way than by faith in Christ; and to him the law always had reference.

5. "The righteousness" or rather justification "which is of the law:" That is, a conceivable but merely ideal justification, as in ver. 3 and ix. 31. The quotation is from Levit. xviii. 5. St. Paul does not mean to say, that Moses intended to describe this justification when he wrote the words here quoted. They contain a promise of happiness to the sincere observer of God's laws. But, inasmuch as they fitly express the principle of justifica-

<p>καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν 8 ἀναγαγεῖν. Ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς 9 πίστεως, ὃ κηρύσσομεν· ὅτι, εἰ ἂν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ πιστεύ- σης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ. 10 Καρδία γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιο-</p>	<p>Christ down <i>from above</i>: or, Who 7 shall descend into the deep? that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead. But what saith it? The 8 word is nigh thee, <i>even</i> in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy 9 mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the 10</p>
---	--

tion by law, the Apostle introduces his own thought in this most appropriate language of the Hebrew lawgiver. See the remarks on quotations in the Commentary on Hebrews, p. 27.

6-9. The principle just stated in illustration of the quotation from Leviticus, applies also to those here made from Deut. xxx. 12-14, with which St. Paul interweaves his own illustrations. The justification of faith is personified and made to speak in the words of the address of Moses to the Israelites, when he endeavours to induce them to obey the law of God, because, instead of being attended by any particular difficulty, it is comparatively easy. As the descending into the deep, or abyss, is set in contrast to the ascending into heaven and explained by bringing up Christ from the dead, it hardly admits of a reasonable doubt that the word *ἄβυσσον* is here used to denote the place of the dead. In Deuteronomy the language is "who shall go over the sea;" but St. Paul merely gives the general thought in the Pentateuch without confining himself to the very words. In Ps. cvii. (Sept. cvi.) 26, "mounting up to the heaven" and "going down to the depths," are expressions employed to describe poetically the vessel rising on the lofty wave and sinking into the trough of the sea, and the two extremes are marked in the Septuagint by the words *οὐρανῶν* and *ἀβύσσων*, just as *heaven* and *hades* are contrasted in Matt. xi. 23 and elsewhere.

"That is," vs. 6, 7, 8: I refer the reader who may wish to see the various views of commentators on this phrase, and its supposed connection both with the words of the Apostle and Moses, to Tholuck's note. It seems to be merely exegetical of the Apostle's application of the words quoted, and equivalent to, 'as if Christ were to be brought down or up.'—The expressions here used, of going up to heaven, or down to the abyss, or over the sea, all convey the same general idea, namely, that of extreme difficulty. Thus in Prov. xxx. 3, 4, we read: "I neither learned wisdom, nor have the knowledge, of the holy. Who hath ascended up into heaven

heart man believeth unto right- eousness; and with the mouth con- 11 fession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever be- lieveth on him shall not be ashamed.	<i>οσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν. Λέγει γὰρ ἡ 11 γραφή· πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται. Οὐ 12 γὰρ ἐστὶ διαστολὴ Ἰουδαίου τε</i>
--	--

or descended? who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell?" The meaning is evident, these things are extremely difficult; they require a superhuman power. And so in the Apocryphal book of Baruch, iii. 29-31, speaking of wisdom the author says: "Who hath gone up to heaven, and taken her, and brought her down from the clouds? Who hath gone over the sea, and found her, and will bring her for pure gold? No man knoweth her way, nor thinketh of her path." It is plain that in the passage quoted Moses does not refer to the particular points discussed by the Apostle. He is persuading the Hebrews to obey the divine law. It does not involve anything of special difficulty, as if the heavens were to be scaled, or the broad and stormy sea, with its mountain billows and deep watery chasms, to be passed over. It is comparatively easy and within the reach of moderate effort. Employing the same language, and adapting it to his purpose, St. Paul expresses thereby this thought, that the blessings of the Gospel scheme of justification were also attainable on the very facile condition of faith, which was within the power of every sincere and earnest seeker after salvation. "In thy mouth and in thy heart" are strong figurative expressions, intimating that the benefit is so easily obtained that it may be said to be even in possession, and ready to be enjoyed and rightly appreciated.

Tholuck, after examining the various methods employed to show that Moses predicts or implies the very point intended by St. Paul, comes to the conclusion that the Apostle expresses his own idea, partly in the language of Deuteronomy. To the same purpose Vatablus, in the *Critici Sacri*. "He does not here quote Moses, because he does not follow the sense of Moses, but only borrows some expressions from him."

The Apostle proceeds to make his application of the language of Moses. "The word:" That is, the subject matter which the expressed word describes. This, which is so readily attainable, is faith in the Gospel; the fundamental principles of which must be cordially believed and publicly professed. The confession of the Lord Jesus, like the Master's own language in Matt. x. 32, implies the open avowal of faith in and attachment to him, notwithstanding the difficulties and persecutions to which such a course may subject the confessor. The resurrection of Christ from the dead is here put by a synecdoche for the whole system of Christianity,

καὶ Ἕλληνας · ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύ- ριος πάντων πλουτῶν εἰς πάν- τας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν. 13 Πᾶς γάρ, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ 14 ὄνομα κυρίου, σωθήσεται. Πῶς	For there is no difference between 12 the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whoso- 13 ever shall call upon the name of
---	---

which stands or falls with this most fundamental principle. The 10th verse contains the simple but all-important statements, that justifying faith must be sincere, and available confession open and public notwithstanding all dangers.

11. "For:" This refers to what had been before said, namely, the facility with which the blessings of the Gospel might be obtained on the condition of faith, inasmuch as they are not exclusively confined to any class, having been promised to the believer, or, as the Apostle says, to every believer. See Isa. xxviii. 16, and similar places.—"Whosoever:" more accurately 'every one who,' *πᾶς ὁ* or *ὅς*. The adjective, which is not expressed either in the Hebrew or Septuagint, although necessarily implied, is probably added by the Apostle, to make the meaning the more definite.—"Believeth on," *ἐπί*. This intimates that he who exercises such a faith, so trusts in its object as to make that his support and dependence. It shows that a justifying faith is not merely an assent of the understanding to all the truths of the Christian religion, but also a trust of the whole inner man on Christ and his system for acceptance and ultimate salvation. It is the germ of the divine life, which unites the soul to God and the Redeemer, and thereby develops itself in the well formed Christian character.

12, 13. "The Jew and the Greek," or Gentile, Heathen; as the word Greek frequently means.—"The same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him." The epithet "rich" implies the fulness of his blessings, and also the free and abundant manner in which he dispenses them.—"Call upon:" That is, pray to, as in 2 Tim. ii. 22, "them that call on the Lord." The description is entirely appropriate, whether applied to God or Christ. But from the words that follow it is probable that "the same Lord" refers to Christ. They harmonize with the usage in the Acts. See ix. 14, 17, where "calling upon the name of the Lord" is equivalent to invoking Christ. In 1 Cor. i. 2, also, Christians are distinguished by the appellation, those "that call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." The verses that follow confirm this view, as Christ is evidently he who is to be preached and heard and believed in, and consequently called on. The quotation in ver. 13 is from Joel ii. 32, (in the Heb. iii. 5,) and in immediate connection with the promise of the abundance and extraordinary effusion of the Spirit, which was verified at the first Christian Pentecost.—With the expression "The same Lord over all," compare the very similar one of St. Peter, "he is Lord of all," employed directly of Christ in Acts x. 36.

- 14 the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall
 15 they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they
- οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται, εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; πῶς δὲ πιστεύουσιν, οὐ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; πῶς δὲ ἀκούσουσι χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος; πῶς 15 δὲ κηρύξουσιν, εἰ μὴ ἀποσταλῶσι; καθὼς γέγραπται· ὡς ὥραι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰ-*

14 et seq. Several commentators, among whom is Professor Stuart, consider this as an objection, either urged by a Jew or stated by the author, which is answered in ver. 16. "The objector apologises for his unbelieving countrymen, that many of them had not heard the Gospel proclaimed. The Apostle answers that many who had heard it did not believe it. To this the Jew replies, that the quotation itself implies that men must hear the Gospel before they can believe it." The 17th verse is also regarded as "the suggestion of the objector, who means to insist by it that many of the Jews are not culpable for unbelief, inasmuch as they have not heard the Gospel, and hearing is necessary to believing." In the 18th the answer is that they have heard.

This theory of direct objection and answer seems both unnecessary and improbable. That the Jew would state or the Apostle allege such an objection is not very likely; because it admits that if the Jew on hearing the Gospel had rejected it, he would be guilty. But this is a postulate, which of course, he would not allow, and the Apostle could not assume. And without supposing any such formal objection and answer, the series of remark is still simple and natural.

Some interpreters suppose that St. Paul has the heathen only in view in vs. 14–18, and that in 19 there is a transition to the Jews or Israelites. Tholuck thinks that the Apostle terminates with ver. 13 the course of thought begun at ver. 4, and then returns to that in vs. 1–3, intending to show that the opportunity of believing had not been withheld from the Jews. He remarks that although in ver. 13 the word *πᾶς*, every one, may be employed to show that the heathen are not excluded, yet those that follow, referring to the comprehensiveness of the expression, may include both, having a special reference however to the Jews. He does not consider the words "not all" in ver. 16, as relating to individuals among heathen and Jews, but rather to the latter as a body, at least to them principally in contradistinction to the mass of heathen. If it should be thought strange that, after what has been said in vs. 15, 16, the question should be raised in ver. 18, "have they not heard?" he considers the difficulty as removed by supposing it to be emphatic, declaring that they had heard most abundantly and fully.

"Sent:." Either by Christ or God or both conjointly, for in this mission

οἴνην, τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων τὰ
 16 ἀγαθά. Ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπή-
 κουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Ἡσαίας
 γὰρ λέγει· κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε
 17 τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; Ἀρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ
 ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος
 18 θεοῦ. Ἀλλὰ λέγω· μὴ οὐκ
 be sent? as it is written, How beau-
 tiful are the feet of them that
 preach the gospel of peace, and
 bring glad tidings of good things!
 But they have not all obeyed the
 16 gospel: for Esaias saith, Lord,
 who hath believed our report? So 17

the Holy Trinity with the Messiah co-operate. Such sending implies both an internal call by the Spirit, and an external commission by legitimate ecclesiastical authority. Although the Prophet is describing poetically the delight with which the messengers who announce the return from the Babylonian captivity are received; yet he has also in view the heralds of the Gospel proclaiming to men its "glad tidings of great joy." The passage, which is from Isa. lii. 7, is not accommodated, but cited in accordance with the ultimate meaning of the prophetic word. See Discourses on Prophecy, the 5th, pp. 86, 87, and Note xvii.

In ver. 16 the quotation from Isa. liii. 1, is applied principally to Jewish unbelief. "Report," ἀκοή. That is, the thing heard, the message. If this meaning of the same word be retained in ver. 17, where our translation renders it "hearing," then "the word of God" will denote the divine command. The different shade of meaning expressed by our translation arises quite naturally from the verb *to hear* before used. If this translation be preferred, the sense will be that faith follows the hearing of the proclaimed word or message.

18. "Their sound went into all the earth" &c. This is a quotation from Ps. xviii. 5, in the Septuagint, with the words of which it agrees accurately. The English notation is xix. 4. The former portion of the Psalm in which this occurs relates to God's glory in the work of creation; the latter, to the excellence of his revealed word. The Psalmist speaks of the divine works, especially the heavenly bodies, as proclaiming to the universe the majesty and power of their almighty framer and director; and the Apostle quotes them, as admirably suited to express the universal proclamation of the Gospel as a new and heavenly creation, a re-making of the moral chaos, and a forming of its discordant materials into one united, harmonious whole, to the honour of its "great original."—"Their sound" &c. The Hebrew has נָדָה, "*line*," the Septuagint φθόγγος, "*sound*," which is followed by the Vulgate "*sonus*." The former may express simply the idea of extension, which is denoted by the very meaning of the word, and in the author's mind it may be carried out indefinitely; and the latter may be a declaration to the same effect in the language of the poets, who speak of the harmonious movements of the heavenly bodies, or the divine harmony of the celestial spheres. In either case, the general thought is the same.

then faith *cometh* by hearing, and
 18 hearing by the word of God. But
 I say, Have they not heard? Yes
 verily, their sound went into all the
 earth, and their words unto the
 19 ends of the world. But I say, Did
 not Israel know? First Moses
 saith, I will provoke you to jealousy
 by *them that are* no people, *and* by
 a foolish nation I will anger you.
 20 But Esaias is very bold, and saith,

ἤκουσαν; μενοῦνγε εἰς πᾶσαν
 τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος
 αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς
 οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν.
 Ἀλλὰ λέγω· μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ 19
 ἔγνω; πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς λέγει·
 ἐγὼ παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ
 ἔθνει, ἐπὶ ἔθνει ἀσυνέτῳ παρορ-
 γιῶ ὑμᾶς. Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ 20
 καὶ λέγει· εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ

The course of remark from ver. 13 is as follows: 'Since the divine promise shows that every one who regards Christ as his Redeemer and thus invokes him shall be saved, it follows that faith in him as such is absolutely necessary. Of course he must be heard of, and therefore proclaimed by divinely sent messengers, who, as the prophet says, will be joyously received. It is true that the Jews in general, and multitudes also of the heathen, have not obeyed the Gospel; but this might have been expected, and was indeed predicted by Isaiah, whose very language intimates that the Gospel must be proclaimed and heard in order to be believed. And I say that it has been so proclaimed most extensively, just as God's being and attributes have been proclaimed to mankind from the creation of the world.'

19-21. "Did not Israel know? As genius is proverbially inventive, two critics, making the word Israel accusative and imagining God to be the subject of the verb, translate thus: "does God then no longer know (that is, love) Israel?" See Olshausen in loc., who very justly remarks, that this idea is not brought forward until xi. 1.—Several interpreters understand the question thus: 'did not Israel know the Gospel?' was it not made known to them? But this would be a vapid repetition of what had been said before; and, moreover, the reply which immediately follows would have no bearing on such an inquiry. The connection in which it stands and the answer made to it sufficiently show that it relates to the calling of the Gentiles and their admission into the Christian church. Did not the Israelitish nation know that such was God's purpose? They did; that is to say, they had in their own Scriptures abundant evidence of this intention. Compare "when they knew" in i. 21 and "seeing" and "hearing" in Matt. xiii. 13. The Apostle begins by citing the testimony of Moses; after which he limits himself to one passage in Isaiah, although he might have quoted many from the same prophet, and also from other Old Testament writers. The language of Moses in Deut. xxxii. 21, expresses God's indignation at the Israelites on account of their idolatries, and implies his

ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην τοῖς
21 ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσι. Πρὸς δὲ τὸν
Ἰσραὴλ λέγει· ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν
ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖρας μου πρὸς
λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέ-
γοντα.

XI. Λέγω οὖν· μὴ ἀπόσατο ὁ
θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; μὴ γέ-
νοιτο· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης
εἰμί, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυ-
2 λῆς Βενιαμίν. Οὐκ ἀπόσατο ὁ
θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, ὃν προ-
έγνω· ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε, ἐν Ἡλίᾳ
τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; ὥς ἐντυγ-

I was found of them that sought
me not; I was made manifest unto
them that asked not after me. But 21
to Israel he saith, All day long I
have stretched forth my hands
unto a disobedient and gainsaying
people.

I say then, Hath God cast away XI.
his people? God forbid. For I also
am an Israelite, of the seed of
Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.
God hath not cast away his people 2
which he foreknew. Wot ye not
what the Scripture saith of Elias?
how he maketh intercession to God

intention to deprive them of their peculiar and covenant blessings, which he would bestow upon the Gentiles, whom they contemptuously regarded as weak and silly, and unworthy even of the name of a people. The indignation or jealousy or emulation which would consequently be excited, is directly stated as a result of this transfer of privileges from the Israelites to the Gentiles.—The quotation from Isaiah lxx. 1, 2, is plain and directly to the point. The Gentiles are represented as those who had “not sought” or “asked after” God. This refers to the condition of ignorance and indifference into which they had sunk before the Gospel was proclaimed to them. See ix. 30, and note. The next verse declares the disobedient and obstinate character of the Israelites, and the earnest though fruitless efforts of untiring goodness to reclaim them.

xi. Having shown why the Jews in general were excluded from the kingdom of the Messiah, St. Paul now proceeds to console those of his nation who had embraced the faith of Jesus, under the affliction which a consideration of the lamentable state of their countrymen must have produced; and to discourage in the Gentile converts any disposition to inordinate self-complacency, and any tendency to treat the Jews with contempt on account of their own spiritual superiority. He states that in fact many Jews had become converts to Christianity; that the unbelief of those who remained obstinately prejudiced against the truth, had been made conducive to the welfare of the Gentiles; and lastly, he speaks as if he confidently expected the coming of a period when the Jews as a nation would acknowledge Jesus as the true Messiah and accept his Gospel.

1-4. “Hath God cast away his people?” Is this a legitimate conclusion from what has been before said respecting the rejection of unbelieving Jews, and the substitution of converted Gentiles? It is not. The Apostle solemnly denies it, and proceeds to sustain his denial. In order

3 against Israel, saying, Lord, they *χάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ·*
 have killed thy prophets, and dig- *κύριε, τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκ-* 3
 ged down thine altars, and I am *τειναν καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου*

rightly to understand the purport of the question, it becomes necessary to settle the meaning of the phrase "his people." This cannot possibly be limited to that portion of the Hebrews who had received the Gospel. It denotes the nation as a whole, as the word is used in the immediately preceding verse. This is the usual sense of the phrase, and it is often employed in connection with the most affectionate expressions of regret on account of their perverseness and wickedness, and the severest denunciations of wrath. See, among a multitude of instances of the same phrase, Ps. xiv. 7, liii. 6, xciv. 14, Isa. xxx. 26, Joel ii. 18, Mic. vi. 2, Luke i. 68, vii. 16. The words "my people" often occur in the same general meaning. See, for a few examples, Isa. i. 3, lii. 4, 5, 6, and Mic. vi. 3, 5. Usage then sustains the general meaning. And the context admits of none other. It is not uncommon, indeed, to explain the verses which immediately follow in such a way as to agree with and even sustain the limited meaning; as if the Apostle had intended to allege the fact of being an Israelite himself as a proof that God had not rejected the nation. But this is a very frigid sense, and quite unworthy of such a writer. Who that properly estimates his character or works can suppose that he would undertake to show, that God had not rejected that portion of his ancient people whom he had admitted to the blessings of Messiah's kingdom? or that, if he thought it worth while to prove such a self-evident proposition, that he would choose to do so by adducing himself as the evidence? This is not in character with so logical a head, or so humble a heart. Not in such manner, or by such help, may we look for the support of truth by PAUL. He does not mean to say, 'God hath not rejected all his people, for I myself am a Christian of Israelitish descent.' According to this view, there is no point in the latter half of the verse. Why does he particularize? "I am," says he, "an Israelite:" He selects the most honourable appellation. "Of the posterity of Abraham:" He recalls to the mind of his readers the venerated patriarch, "the pillar" of the nation, as Maimonides denominates him. "Of the tribe of Benjamin:" The least yet most esteemed of all, who had allied themselves to the tribe of Judah, and had not rejected the divinely established government of "the house of David," the softly flowing waters of Siloah: Isa. viii. 6. Had he merely intended to show that the whole of God's ancient people had not been cast away by alleging himself as an example, it would have been enough to say, 'I claim that I myself have not been rejected.' Undoubtedly he employs these expressions under the influence of a very different feeling. They all imply a depth of love for his nation, a love which could not possibly bear the thought of their final and irrecover-

κατέσκαψαν· καὶ γὰρ ὑπελείφθην left alone, and they seek my life.
 μόνος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν But what saith the answer of God 4
 4 μου. Ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ unto him? I have reserved to my-

able rejection. He means to tell them, that as an Israelite, a son of Abraham, one of the little yet honoured tribe of Benjamin, it is the farthest from his thoughts, to represent his beloved nation as thus rejected by God, who had so highly regarded and honoured them.

The Apostle then proceeds to illustrate what he had said by referring to the case of Elijah and the condition of the Israelites in the time of that prophet. His illustration has been supposed to confirm the limited meaning of the words "his people." But this arises from a mistaken view of its scope and intention. The prophet, depressed by melancholy apprehension, supposes himself to be the only true worshipper of Jehovah left among the multitudes of Hebrews. But the divine communication consoles him with the assurance that, notwithstanding the wretchedly degenerate condition of the chosen people, God has still seven thousand sincere worshippers. These faithful adherents have been supposed to correspond with the "people" whom the Apostle says "God hath not rejected;" and the analogy has been thought to run thus: As in the time of Elijah God had his seven thousand devoted servants who were even then his chosen people; so the Jews who have received Jesus as the Messiah are now his people, and these he hath not rejected. But this is not the point of comparison. Rather, in accordance with the analogy of God's dealings as exhibited in Scripture, it runs thus: As, in the degenerate days of the prophet, the seven thousand faithful, the holy "remnant," preserved the true religion, and thus prevented the divine vengeance from exterminating the whole nation; so now, those holy and faithful Israelites who have embraced the Gospel, preserve their faithless brethren from utter and final abandonment by God. The "little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." The holy few preserve, in a degree, the multitude; the devoted portion consecrates, in a sense, the whole mass.

The correctness of this view is sustained also by what follows. The introductory words of ver. 11 evidently refer to those of ver. 1, the subject of which is certainly in the Apostle's mind. The *falling* corresponds with the *casting off*, and both are denied in the same emphatic terms. Yet it is unquestioned that the stumbling and the falling relate to the nation; and indeed the subsequent verses place this beyond all doubt. The same conclusion follows from ver. 16, where "the lump" or mass, and "the branches," both of which are said to be "holy," correspond with the body of the nation. And what is stated in vs. 28, 29, settles the true interpretation of the phrase under consideration. 'As respects the Gospel, they are enemies to God; but as respects God's choice of the nation to be his covenant people, they are beloved on account of their fathers: for God's gracious gifts

self seven thousand men, who have *χρηματισμός ; κατέλιπον ἑμαντῶ*
 not bowed the knee to *the image of* *ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας, οἵτινες*
 5 Baal. Even so then at this pres- *οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ.*

and the benefits of that state into which he calls and places, are matters in relation to which he does not change his mind.' This is true, although multitudes who have been placed in that state may forfeit its blessings through neglect and sin.

The conclusion therefore is, that the Apostle regards the mass of the Israelites as still, notwithstanding their infidelity and opposition to Christianity, as in a modified sense God's people, although, in another respect, he represents them as not being his people. This view is, moreover, in accordance with certain prophecies, and especially with that symbolical prediction in Hos. iii. It harmonizes with the remarkable fact, that Providence has preserved the Jews as a people, though not properly as a political nation distinguished from others; it sanctions the expectation, evidently cherished by the Apostle and in accordance with what had been predicted, of their future conversion; and it ought to excite, animate, and encourage Christians to adopt the most efficacious measures in order to accomplish a consummation so earnestly and devoutly to be wished.

"Whom he foreknew:" See the note on viii. 29, p. 150.—"Wot:" That is, know. The word is of Saxon origin, and is employed in the older English versions both here and elsewhere. It occurs also in the authorised in 2 Cor. viii. 1, "do you to wit," for 'inform you;' and in Phil. i. 22, "I wot not." These are the only instances in which it is employed as the translation of *γνωρίζω*, although the Greek word occurs 24 times. In Acts iii. 17, the original of "I wot," is *οἶδα*.—The quotation is from 1 Kings xix. 10, 18.—"Of Elias:" The Greek is *ἐν Ἠλίᾳ*. The preposition may be rendered *of* or *concerning* as the Hebrew *beth* often means. Thus David Kimchi on Isa. xi. 4, 5, uses it: "Concerning the Messiah—concerning the righteous." And, although the passage is not cited so much in reference to the prophet as to the seven thousand faithful Israelites; yet, as he was the most distinguished person, to whom the divine oracle had been communicated, the language may well be said to respect him. Still, it is very probable that the best translation is *in*, and that the Apostle adopts a method of quoting very common with the Rabbies. Thus they say, it is written in the creation, meaning Gen. i.; in the concubine, referring to the story of the Levite mentioned in Judg. xix.; in Gabriel, that is, Dan. ix. 21 et seq.; and so, in Moses and in David.* In the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas, chap. xii., we have perhaps an instance of this mode of reference: *ἡ παράβασις διὰ τοῦ ὄφeos ἐν Εὐᾶ γέγονε*, the transgression took place by means of the serpent

* See Surenhusius ubi sup., Thesis 49, p. 81; and Michaelis' Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. I. Part I. Chap. iv. Sect. v. pp. 133, 134, Edit. Lond. 1823.

5 Οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ ent time also there is a remnant ac-
 λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος cording to the election of grace.
 6 γέγονεν. Εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκέτι And if by grace, then is it no more 6

in Eve. Thus St. Paul may say 'in Elijah,' meaning, in that part of Scripture which relates his history. The Vulgate has, in Elia, and is followed by Wiclif and the Rheims translation. Some commentators trace the same method of quotation in Mark xii. 26, where they translate "in the bush." This is our authorised version, and it coincides with Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva and Rheims. Wiclif has, "the book of Moises on the buysch," meaning probably that part of the Pentateuch which *relates to* the bush and the occurrence there. The other translations may very fairly be understood to mean that God spake in the bush. Besides, the preposition, which is ἐπί, is better rendered *at*, and connected with the words that follow, "God spake unto him."—Τῇ Βάαλ. The use of the feminine article has led several critics to suppose an ellipsis of εἰκόνη, image, and to construe Βάαλ in the genitive, thus; 'to the image of Baal.' But, as Tholuck remarks, in this case we would expect the article before the genitive. The expedient is also quite unnecessary, as Baal is both masculine and feminine. The latter form occurs in Hos. ii. 8, and Zeph. i. 4, Sept. Although in the place cited the Septuagint has the former, yet St. Paul, quoting from memory, uses the gender most familiar, or which first occurs to him. Whether the Phenician and Syrian idolaters united both sexes in Baal, or held the notion of a male and a female Baal, is uncertain. The idea of Gesenius, which Tholuck regards as on the whole the most probable, is, that the feminine gender had been substituted for the masculine, from disrespect to the pretended deity. Thus the Rabbies speak of heathen *gods* in the feminine, and passages to the same effect are found in the Koran. It is also quite probable that the Jews altered Beelzebub, the lord of *flies*, into Beelzebub, the *dung*-lord, through contempt. See Robinson on the word.

5. "A remnant according to the election of grace :—" That is, a portion of the whole people who have embraced the Gospel through God's gracious choice. The language has a retrospective reference to ix. 27 and 11, where see the notes.

6. The latter half of this verse, which Hahn has introduced in brackets, is by many regarded as a gloss, and stricken out of the text. It is certain that several and very important ancient authorities reject the words; and yet, on the other hand, the Vatican manuscript and the Syriac version retain them. It has been thought that a marginal gloss would have been constructed more in accordance with the form of the preceding clause; but this remark would apply as well to the supposition of its originality. It does not indeed add any idea not already contained in the former half;

<p>of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if <i>it be</i> of works, then is it no more grace; otherwise</p> <p>7 work is no more work. What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for, but the election hath obtained it, and the</p> <p>8 rest were blinded; according as it</p>	<p>ἐξ ἔργων, ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκ- ἐτι γίνεται χάρις. [εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκέτι ἐστὶ χάρις, ἐπει τὸ ἔργον οὐκέτι ἐστὶν ἔργον.]</p> <p>Τί οὖν; ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦτο 7 οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν, ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέ- τυχεν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθη- σαν, καθὼς γέγραπται· ἔδωκεν 8</p>
---	---

still, the Apostle may repeat that idea in another form for the sake of emphasis. It is difficult to decide the question of its genuineness; but the weight of external evidence seems to be against it. The sentiment in the verse may be thus expressed: 'The preservation of a remnant of Jews who embrace the Gospel and are retained as God's elect people, results from the divine choice and favour, and not from human effort or merit; and were this not the case, favour would not be favour, [and the distinction between favour and merit be lost.]'

7. "What then?" What has been the issue? It is what the author had before stated in ix. 31 and x. 3, with this difference, that there he contrasts the failure of the mass of the Jews with the success of the Gentile converts, while here the contrast lies between the former and that portion of their brethren who had embraced the Gospel. These are called "the election." This is simply the abstract for the concrete 'the elect,' and the connection shows that it is limited to Jewish converts. The remainder of the people have been suffered to continue blind. Their sin has become judicially their punishment.

8-10. The Apostle now quotes passages from the Old Testament, showing that the threat of such judicial punishment had been denounced by God against obstinate and impenitent offenders. The places referred to are principally the following, though there is an allusion to and even a selection of words from others of similar import. Isa. xxix. 10, vi. 10, Deut. xxix. 4, Ps. lxix. 22, 23.—In ver. 9 the *εἰς* is Hebraistic, and the accusative nouns with the prepositions are equivalent to the nominative without. The general meaning of this verse and the next is as follows: 'Let the blessings which they enjoy be converted into occasions of injury, and thus become divine punishments, and a recompense for their sinful conduct.' God's retributive justice is recognised in this penal infliction, which is consequently represented as brought on these persons by him.—The clause "unto this day," is separated by some editors from the immediately preceding words, and connected with the 7th verse, all the 8th except three words being parenthetical; and Koppe regards them as being added by St. Paul in order to accommodate the language to his own times. But such an arrangement is both unnecessary and improbable. The very

<p>αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξ- εως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἕως τῆς 9 σήμερον ἡμέρας. Καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει· γεννηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐ- τῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς θήραν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀντα-</p>	<p>is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this day. And David saith, Let their table be 9 made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block and a recompense</p>
--	--

words are found in the text of Deuteronomy, and the expression is a very usual one in the historical books of the Old Testament. See Gen. xlviii. 15, Deut. xxxiv. 6, Josh. iv. 9, xxii. 17, xxiii. 8, 2 Sam. iv. 3, 1 Kings viii. 8, 2 Kings xvii. 34, 2 Chron. v. 9. Besides, this construction separates the contents of the 8th verse from those of the 9th and 10th, although the general thought is identically the same; and this is unnatural. It is probable that, in quoting the words from Deuteronomy, the Apostle may have intended to apply them to his own time, as he says in 2 Cor. iii. 15, "*even unto this day*, when Moses is read the veil is upon their heart." But they must not be separated from the preceding part of the quotation.—"Spirit of slumber:" This does not refer to any spirit, whether good or bad, commissioned by God to produce spiritual sleep. Even if the form of expression had its origin in the idea of God's Holy Spirit producing a religious state of the inner man, and of unholy spirits influencing the soul to evil; still, the result, the condition, is all that is intended, and the phrase may be pleonastic, expressive merely of deep sleep, and denoting a state of apathy, total and sinful apathy. Tholuck prefers explaining the word 'spirit' as equivalent to *effective power*, *Kraft*. And this seems to agree with the use of the word 'spirit' in some other places. Comp. Isa. xi. 2, "spirit of wisdom," &c.; Rom. viii. 15, "spirit of bondage;" Gal. vi. 1, "spirit of meekness."

11, 12. "I say then:" These words, as I before remarked in the note on ver. 1, refer back to that verse, and determine in favour of the comprehensive sense of the phrase "his people." The general meaning is this: 'Although the Jews have for a time refused the Gospel through inveterate prejudice and judicial blindness, yet it is not to be thought that this has been permitted by God with the view of effecting their irrevocable rejection and utter ruin. By no means. Their temporary rejection has been made the occasion of extending the Gospel to Gentiles. And it is thus intended to excite the Jews to emulate their example and to embrace the same faith. And were this to be the result, what immense blessings would accrue to mankind, since their faithlessness has been made the occasion of so much benefit. If divine wisdom causes even the unbelief of the Jews to advance his plans by extending Christianity, much rather will this same wisdom make their submission to the faith of the Gospel illustrate its truth, and promote the best interests of the world.'

- 10 unto them; let their eyes be dark- πόδομα αὐτοῖς · σκοτισθήτωσαν 10
 ened, that they may not see, and οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπ-
 bow down their back alway. ειν, καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν δια-
 11 I say then, Have they stumbled παντὸς σύγκαμψον.
 that they should fall? God forbid: Λέγω οὖν · μὴ ἔπταισαν, ἵνα 11

“Have they stumbled that they should fall?” In this translation the last verb continues the figure which begins with the first. But προσκόπτω is the usual Biblical word for stumble. Πταίω, which is here employed, occurs only four other times in the New Testament, namely, James ii. 10, iii. 2 twice, and 2 Pet. i. 10. In the last case it may mean ‘fail of success,’ in the three former, ‘in duty,’ “offend.” It is doubtful whether in the text it refers to such failure, or whether it is used in its classical meaning, to strike against, to stumble. Whichever version be adopted, the general idea in the question remains unaltered. In the one case it will be, have they sinned, or failed to secure the blessing of acceptance with God? and in the other, have they allowed themselves to be so disgusted with and perverted from the truth? In either view moral and spiritual degradation is alike implied. The falling immediately afterwards mentioned must be regarded as emphatic, implying utter and irrecoverable ruin. The same word is indeed employed in ver. 22, but in a modified sense. The connection in the two instances proves that in the former the meaning is stronger than in the latter. Such different shades of signification of the same word may be found in almost all compositions.

“To provoke to jealousy:” This word is evidently employed in reference to what had been before said in the quotation from Deuteronomy contained in x. 19, the Apostle omitting, however, the harsher term, “I will anger.” Moses undoubtedly uses it in the strong sense expressed by our translation; but here St. Paul appears to employ it in the milder form, to express an inclination to emulate and become equal to the Gentile converts in faith and advantages. The thought of human passion, such as anger, jealousy, or envy of superior benefit, is out of the question; and in ver. 14 our own translation has modified the expression, and rendered the same term, “to provoke to *emulation*,” where excite would have been a still more appropriate verb.—The riches of the world denotes the abundant favour bestowed on the Gentiles through the Gospel rejected by the Jews.—“Diminishing:” In the margin it is “decay or loss,” and the former of these two words more nearly expresses the sense than either of the others. The Greek is ἥττημα, from ἥττων or ἥσσω, *worse*, and conveys the idea of a bad condition. Hence it is used, both in the form of a noun and a verb, in Isa. xxxi. 8, 9. This is the only place in which the noun occurs in the Old Testament. Although the best critics differ as to the meaning of the Hebrew in this passage, some explaining it of destruction in battle, others of

<p>πέσωσι; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς τὸ παραζηλῶσαι 12 αὐτούς. Εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμος, καὶ τὸ</p>	<p>but <i>rather</i> through their fall salva- tion <i>is come</i> unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. Now if 12 the fall of them <i>be</i> the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them</p>
--	--

melting, wasting away, and others again, among whom is Gesenius, of a state of tributary subjection; yet, there is no doubt that it denotes a very unhappy condition, and this is expressed by the term employed by the Septuagint. As a verb it is used in 2 Pet. ii. 19, 20, and is translated "overcome," where our English term *worsted* would correspond with the Greek; and in 2 Cor. xii. 13, the translation is, "ye were inferior," that is, less distinguished. In 1 Cor. vi. 7, the noun expresses a bad state of religious character, such as implies having become *worse*, deterioration, declension. These are the only places where the word is found in the New Testament. The evident meaning is, a bad and unhappy condition. The idea of diminution, diminishing, fewness, applied to this text, seems to have arisen from supposing some such sense to be required by the antithetic word "fulness," πλήρωμα, thought to express the complete conversion of the Jews. But the idea of diminishing the whole Hebrew nation by so comparatively trifling a secession as the converted portion, however considerable in itself, would form, is not admissible. And if the word be taken in the sense of *fewness*, it must denote the number of converts, and then the contrast would be lost. The Apostle would speak of the fall of *them*, that is, of the nation in general, in contradistinction to the fewness of *them*, that is, of the converted body. This is quite improbable.—"Fulness" may express a condition of general conversion, a state of complete and full benediction, and thus it will afford a suitable antithesis to the wretched condition denoted by the other word. Compare, "the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ," in xv. 29.

13, 14. "I magnify mine office:" Literally, 'I honour my ministry.' The Apostle refers certainly to his official relation to the Gentiles, as having been called by God to make known the Gospel to them in particular. He means that, as an ambassador to them, he honours his ministry, by showing the influence which the belief or infidelity of the Jews is calculated to exert on his success. If their unbelief is made by God the occasion of Gentile conversion, how much rather would their faith become so? It is as if he had said, My efforts to excite the Jews tend to exalt the honour of my ministry to the Gentiles, because their conversion is accelerated by that of the Jews.—"My flesh:" This term expresses deep affection. It originates from what is said of the marriage relation in Genesis ii. 24, and is employed to mark the closest union and most intense interest and love. Thus the crafty Laban says to Jacob, "Surely thou art my bone and my

the riches of the Gentiles, how 13 much more their fulness? For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I 14 magnify mine office; if by any means I may provoke to emulation <i>them which are</i> my flesh, and might	ἡττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐ- 13 τῶν; Ὑμῖν γὰρ λέγω ταῖς ἔθνεσιν· ἐφ' ὅσον μέν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, τὴν δια- 14 κονίαν μου δοξάζω, εἰπὼς παρα-
---	---

flesh:" Gen. xxix. 14. Thus Abimelech says to his mother's brethren whose favour he was desirous of conciliating; "I am your bone and your flesh:" Judg. ix. 2. In the same terms the Israelites address David in applying to him to become their king: 2 Sam. v. 1. And by this figure the mystical union of Christ and his church is represented in Eph. v. 30: "We are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones." The same expressive figure is still employed by the eastern nations of Asia to denote a man's near kindred.

15. "The casting away" in this verse evidently corresponds with 'the decay, bad condition' mentioned in the 12th. If this rejection of them, this bad condition of theirs, result in the blessed reconciliation of the Gentiles; how shall the future reception of them be characterised, but as "life from the dead?" The last clause may denote, according to the view of many commentators, the blessing both of a moral resurrection of the soul, and a future glorious resurrection of the body; and thus it will express the full consummation to be followed by so general a conversion. Or, it may be a figure to denote the greatest possible happiness. The latter is the simpler, and more probable view.

16. This verse consists of two parallel clauses, each of which conveys the same *general* idea. The former has been thought to allude to the first fruits offered to God, from which the lump or mass of dough was kneaded to make the consecrated cake. See Levit. ii. 12, 14, and Num. xv. 20, 21. Thus the first fruits will be general, comprehending the mass as a part of it, and corresponding with the root or trunk which contains the germ and substance of the branches which spring from it. Thus Olshausen. But it is unnecessary to assume any such correspondence to have been intended. The language of the first clause alludes to that in Num. xv. 20, 21: "Ye shall offer up a cake" &c. The Septuagint is ἀπαρχὴν φυράματος ὑμῶν—ἀπ' ἀρχῆς φυράματος ὑμῶν the first fruits of your dough—of the first of your dough. The word φύραμα, derived from φύρω, to mix, especially with something moist, occurs only four times in the Old Testament, and five in the New, including the place under examination; and in every instance, except ix. 21, where it is used for potters' clay, it means, either a kneading trough, or a mass of kneaded dough. See Exod. viii. 3, xii. 34, Num. xv. 20 21 1 Cor. v. 6, 7 Gal. v. 9. And in the two places in Exodus,

ζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ σώσω 15 τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀπο- βολὴ αὐτῶν καταλλαγὴ κόσμου, τίς ἡ πρόσληψις, εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ 16 νεκρῶν; Εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα· καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα	save some of them. For if the 15 casting away of them <i>be</i> the re- conciling of the world, what <i>shall</i> the receiving <i>of them be</i> , but life from the dead? For if the first-fruit 16 <i>be</i> holy, the lump <i>is</i> also <i>holy</i> ; and if the root <i>be</i> holy, so <i>are</i> the
---	---

where our translation has “kneading troughs,” the marginal reading is “dough.” “The lump” is plainly the whole mass of the dough intended to be baked, and “the first of” it is that portion of the whole, the “cake” or loaf, which was consecrated to God. Since this is holy, so also, in a modified sense, is the whole mass of which it is a part. The same idea runs through the Apostle’s comparison, which appears before in vs. 2–5: ‘a part consecrates and preserves the whole.’ In order to make a perfect parallel with the next clause, some explain this of the pious ancestry of the Jews, thus: ‘If the patriarchs were dedicated to God, so in a certain sense are all their posterity.’ Others, however, with greater probability, suppose a reference to the *first* converts who were Jews. And this agrees with the usual meaning of the word. Compare viii. 23, where “first-fruits” means the *first* dispensed spiritual blessings; xvi. 5, where “the first-fruits of Achaia,” is used to express the *earliest* convert; and in 1 Cor. xv. 20 “the first-fruits of them that slept,” designates Christ as risen from the dead, the *first* and *chief* of those who belong to him.

In the next clause the meaning and bearing of the word *root* is to be determined. Some late commentators consider it as figurative of the divinely established theocracy. This being continued in, is regarded as identical with, the genuine spiritual children of Abraham. The branches are the people merely externally connected. In this case, however, the converted Jews would constitute the root in the Apostle’s time. And it is observable that he does not say *the branches* were broken off, but *some of them*. The unbroken ones then would be identical with the root. Thus the representation becomes very confused.—The figure expresses origin and refers back to the founders of the nation. If the really religious patriarchs were consecrated to God and holy, then the whole mass of their descendants partake somewhat of the divine consecration. This view corresponds with ver. 28, “beloved for the fathers’ sakes.” The idea of holiness here predicated of the entire mass must, of course, be limited by the nature of the case. It can mean nothing more than that they are still regarded kindly by God in consequence of the covenant relation which he had formed with them in the persons of their ancestors, which still inclines him to favour the descendants; just as a devoted husband might still feel some affectionate regard for a repudiated wife, and even contemplate a reunion.

17 branches. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches: but if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the

ἀγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι. Εἰ δέ τινες 17
τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ
δὲ ἀγριέλαιος ὢν ἐνεκεντρίσθης
ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ συγκοινωνὸς τῆς
ρίζης καὶ τῆς πιότητος τῆς ἐλαίας
ἐγένου, μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλά- 18
δων· εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι, οὐ σὺ

17, 18. St. Paul says, "some are broken off." He might have represented the tree as nearly stripped, so great had been the excision; but to spare the feelings of his brethren, he uses a modified expression.—"Among them," ἐν αὐτοῖς. That is, say some, 'in the place of them.' This is the view of Theophylact,* who substitutes ἀντί for ἐν, thus making the antecedent to be the broken-off branches. But this meaning of ἐν is not supported, neither does it agree with the force of the preposition in συγκοινωνός 'partaker *along with* them.' It is evident that the Apostle means, 'among them that remain,' the antecedent being implied in the previous statement. It is in connection with these remaining branches that the Gentile grafts partake of the fatness of the tree.—The author enlarges on the figure in the latter half of the previous verse. He compares the Gentiles to a wild olive, a tree proverbially unprofitable. However cautious he is not to offend the Jews, (see x. 2,) he does not hesitate to represent the Gentiles under a figure that might be considered as harsh. It has been thought somewhat strange that the Apostle should speak of inserting grafts of a wild olive, which of course would be useless and unproductive, among the branches of a good one. But even allowing such a procedure to be unreasonable, and the supposition of its being ever practised improbable; still, the representation, as descriptive of the introduction of Gentiles among the old covenant people, heightens the effect. The illustration is intended to show that these slips are engrafted into "the good olive tree" for their benefit; not that they might retain in connection therewith their former wild and unproductive nature, but that they might draw from its sap such nourishment as should make even the wild slips themselves produce fruit equally good with that of the parent plant. That such would not be the result in the case of a literal engrafting is no objection to the Apostle's remark. He does not say it would. He may intend to mark a difference in this respect between the operations of nature and those of grace. To say that he did not know what would be the result of such engrafting, is to assume an ignorance for which the censorious hypercritic has no ground. Notwithstanding the seeming improbability of introducing slips of wild olive into a cultivated tree, it is said to have been occasionally practised

* On Romans, Opera, Venet. 1755, Tom. ii. p. 82.

<p>τὴν ῥίζαν βαστάζεις, ἀλλ' ἡ ῥίζα 19 σέ. Ἐρεῖς οὖν · ἐξεκλάσθησαν κλάδοι, ἵνα ἐγὼ ἐγκεντρισθῶ. 20 Καλῶς · τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθη- σαν, σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἔστηκας · μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ. 21 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν</p>	<p>root thee. Thou wilt say then, 19 The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; be- 20 cause of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: for if 21 God spared not the natural branches, <i>take heed</i> lest he also spare not thee.</p>
--	---

in order to increase the fruitfulness of the bearing olive. Tholuck and Olshausen refer, for proof of this, to Columella de re rustica, v. 9; to Palladius de insitione, xiv. 53, and to Schultz, Leitungen des Hoechsten, Th. v. p. 88.

In ver. 18, the word root, which properly denotes those portions of the tree which are embedded and secured under the ground, is employed also to express the trunk, as here, and sometimes the whole plant, as we often use the word in English. See the note on Heb. xii. 15, p. 167. After the word "boast," the reader must supply some such term as 'remember.'

19, 21. The ἐγώ, "I," is probably emphatic, as the form of the verb in general sufficiently designates the person.—"Well:" Allowing it to be so, the Apostle does not say that this was the sole or even the chief reason for the divine procedure.—"*Take heed*:" This is introduced by the translator. The ellipsis would have been more naturally supplied by the word "fear" from the preceding verse.

22-24. The kindness and the severity of the divine procedure are here pointed out in its bearing respectively on Gentile converts and apostatizing Jews, with a warning to the former that the continuance of this kindness to them depended on the condition of their faithful adherence to the Gospel. Otherwise they also would be subjected to the fate of the apostate Jews. And, on the other hand, if the apostate Jews abandon their prejudice and unbelief, they shall be restored to their former spiritual relation to God, who is abundantly able to restore them. The probability and comparative facility of this result are expressed in ver. 24 by a comparison. As it would be a process much more natural to re-insert grafts of the productive olive into their own original tree than to introduce wild and fruitless slips; so is it the more reasonable to expect such a restoration of the Jews into their former state of religious connection with God.

25. "Mystery:" It is important to have a clear idea of the meaning of this word in the New Testament. It is employed both in relation to facts and principles or doctrines. Sometimes it denotes such actual truths as can only become known by revelation, since they are not discoverable merely by human reason. Thus, in 1 Cor. xv. 51, speaking of the change which the body is to undergo at the end of the present condition of things,

- 22 Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but towards thee, goodness, if thou continue in *his* goodness; otherwise thou also shalt
 23 be cut off. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graff
 24 them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted
- κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται. Ἰδὲ οὖν χρη- 22
 στότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτο-
 μίαν, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότητα, εἰὰν ἐπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι· ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ· κἀκεῖνοι δέ, εἰὰν 23
 μὴ ἐπιμείνωσι τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἐγκεν-
 τρισθήσονται· δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτούς. Εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν 24

St. Paul says, "I show you a mystery." Again, it denotes real facts the manner and operation of which we cannot fully comprehend, and in this sense the Apostle calls the spiritual union of "Christ and the church a great mystery:" Eph. v. 32. And it is often applied to what is in no respect mysterious in itself, but was either not at all or but very imperfectly known. Thus, in Eph. iii. 3, 4, 9, it expresses the divine intention of uniting Gentiles and Jews in the one church of Christ, "in other ages not made known as now revealed." Here it marks that spiritual blindness and hardness of heart which God permitted to affect the Israelites, a fact which had been unknown and was inexplicable to many.—Some ancient authorities read *ἐαυτοῖς* alone, some have the preposition *ἐν*, and some *παρά*. The sense is not affected.—St. Paul is addressing himself principally to the Gentile converts. In order to prevent them from cherishing feelings of superiority over the Jewish nation, he informs them of what they did not before know, namely, that the unhappy spiritual condition of the Jews was only partial and transitory. "In part" is better connected with Israel than with blindness. The meaning is not, 'blindness in some respects has affected them,' but, 'it has taken place on *a part* of them. This phrase is in evident contrast with "*all* Israel," in the next verse. The expression is like the modified language of ver. 17, "*some* of the branches are broken off," and doubtless was prompted by the same motive. See the note there.—The next point shows this state to be temporary: "until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." This does not express absolute universality, but only a very extensive and general state of Gentile conversion; and thus it corresponds with the language in the next verse, "all Israel shall be saved," meaning, the nation in general. The Apostle's remarks in vs. 12–15 seem to imply an expectation on his part that Jewish conversion would promote that of Gentiles; a representation which would hardly comport with the theory that a conversion of all Gentiles is to precede that of the Israelitish body.

26, 27. "All Israel:" That is, the whole nation which shall then subsist. Such expressions are often used in a general sense.—"Shall be

ἐξεκόπης ἀγριελαίου καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ἐνεκεντρίσθης εἰς καλλιέλαιον, πόσῳ μᾶλλον οὗτοι οἱ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκεντρισθήσονται
 25 τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ. Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, (ἵνα μὴ ᾗτε παρ' ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι,) ὅτι πώρως ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν, ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσ-
 26 ἔλθῃ. Καὶ οὕτω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ

contrary to nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural *branches*, be grafted into their own olive tree? For I would not, brethren, that ye 25 should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so 26 all Israel shall be saved: as it is

saved:” In other words, converted to the Gospel and partake of its blessings. Comp. x. 1. On the promise here made, see Whitby’s Appendix to his notes on this chapter, at the end of his Commentary on the Epistle.

In these verses the Apostle quotes or refers to Isa. lix. 20, 21, Ps. xiii. 7 in the Septuagint, or xiv. in the Hebrew and English. He may also have in view Jer. xxxi. 33, 34, which relates to the same subject, and is quoted also in Heb. viii. 10, where see the note, pp. 107, 108. The words “when I shall take away their sins” are added from the Sept. of Isa. xxvii. 9, with which they agree, except in the alteration of the singular pronoun into the plural. The quotation from Isa. lix. is imperfect, and the reader is expected to supply the deficiency. This is usual with Jewish writers. See note on iv. 18, p. 70. The citation corresponds with the Septuagint, except in the ἐκ for ἐνεκεν, on account of. Koppe thinks that this was probably the original reading here, and that ΕΚ, a contraction of it, was altered to ἐκ, through a misunderstanding of some transcriber. The Hebrew is “to Zion.” The reading *on account of* would suit the Apostle’s immediate purpose exceedingly well, as he is speaking of Israel’s future elevation. He must therefore have had some reason for preferring *from*. Tholuck suggests that it may have been to call attention to the fact, that the Redeemer sprang from the very people whom he was to convert. But he is not satisfied either with this or any other solution stated by expositors. He conjectures either that ἐκ has been substituted by some transcribers for ἐνεκεν, or that the author, through lapse of memory, varies occasionally from the Hebrew or the Septuagint. But this is even less satisfactory. The remark of Fritzsche, which he thinks inadmissible, appears to be entitled to great consideration. This commentator regards it as altogether improbable that a passage of Scripture, to which St. Paul attaches so much importance and which he must frequently have read with great care, should have at all escaped his memory, or, if so, not have been examined. Vitranga on the text in Isaiah conjectures that, along with this passage, the Apostle connected in his mind several others, and particularly that in the Psalm referred to, where “sal-

written, There shall come out of	σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται·
Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn	ἥξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος καὶ
27 away ungodliness from Jacob: for	ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ.
this is my covenant unto them, when	Καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ 27
28 I shall take away their sins. As	διαθήκη, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς
concerning the gospel, <i>they are ene-</i>	ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν. Κατὰ μὲν τὸ 28

vation *from* Zion" is prayed for. And it is very probable that the words of the Psalm did suggest the form of expression. Still it does not appear at all improbable that, in quoting the prediction of Isaiah, St. Paul modifies the language so as to suit the particular shade of thought he wished to convey. The general meaning he does not alter. The Hebrew prophet speaks of the Redeemer as coming to Zion. This was perfectly natural, as Zion was the centre of national glory. The Christian Apostle, not denying that the Redeemer had come *to* Zion, speaks of his marching as it were triumphantly *out* of Zion, and subduing all opposition. Thus the passage, as applied in the Epistle, will be understood figuratively, and be equivalent to Isa. ii. 3, "*out* of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord *from* Jerusalem." A similar modification is probably to be found in Eph. iv. 8. In reference to the supply of divine blessings to be hereafter dispensed, the Psalmist says, lxviii. 18, "thou hast *received* gifts *for* men;" while the Apostle, applying the words to the effusion which had actually taken place, changes the original phrase into, "he *gave* gifts *unto* men."

"And shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:" The literal meaning of the Hebrew is given in the English translation of Isaiah: "unto them that turn away from transgression in Jacob." Grotius, on the text in Romans, thinks it evident that the Greek translator used a Hebrew copy with a reading slightly differing from the present. This is possible. But the supposition is entirely unnecessary, as this translator may have intended to give merely the general meaning of the passage, intermingling therewith his own comments. "When the prophecy declares," says Vitranga, "that the Messiah would come to Zion, meaning, for its benefit, and to them that turn away from transgression in Jacob, it expresses the object for which he would come, to convert the posterity of Jacob from sin. So the Chaldee: 'to turn the rebels of the house of Jacob to the law.' And Kimchi adds: 'because then all the Israelites shall be thoroughly converted.'" Most probably the Septuagint intended to convey the same thought; and as it was particularly appropriate to St. Paul's design, and, moreover, intended to confirm the view so often expressed or implied before, that such conversion can only be effected through the grace of the Redeemer, the reason of his preferring the Septuagint version of the clause is evident.—Symmachus agrees with the Hebrew: τοῖς ἀποστρέψασιν ἀσεβειαν ἐν Ἰακώβ. So also Aquila, except that he substitutes ἀθεσίαν for ἀσεβειαν. See Pro-

<p>εὐαγγέλιον ἐχθροὶ δι' ὑμᾶς, κατὰ δε τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ 29 τοὺς πατέρας· ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλῆσις τοῦ 30 θεοῦ. Ὡσπερ γὰρ καὶ ὑμεῖς</p>	<p>mies for your sakes; but as touch- ing the election, <i>they are</i> beloved for the fathers' sakes: for the gifts 29 and calling of God <i>are</i> without re- pentance. For as ye in times past 30 have not believed God, yet have</p>
---	--

copius in Drusius, Crit. Sac. on Isaiah, or Montfaucon's Hexaplorum Originis quæ supersunt, Tom. ii. p. 184.

28, 29. These verses have already been sufficiently explained in the note on ver. 1, p. 195, 196.

31, 32. The 30th verse refers to the former condition of the Gentiles, as stated in ix. 30 and x. 20, and also to the fact that Jewish unbelief had been made the occasion of extending the Gospel to them, as mentioned in vs. 11, 12, 15. In the next verse, some interpreters place the comma after ἐλέει, translating, 'so these also have now become unfaithful for your mercy.' This is the Rheims translation, and the meaning of it is to this effect: their faithless condition has resulted in your obtaining mercy. But this would be a mere repetition of what had just been said, and would also leave the last clause without any suitable dependence on what precedes it. The Vulgate has adopted this same punctuation, but translates so as to suggest a different meaning: non crediderunt in vestram misericordiam.—Luther gives the same idea, 'not believe in the mercy which has happened unto you,' and so also Tyndale and Cranmer. But, although this would be an additional thought to that just before stated, yet the want of connection and dependence would still remain. The comma should follow ἡπερίθυσαν. The objection that, in this case, ἵνα must precede τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει is not of much weight, as instances occur where this and other particles are inserted within the clauses which they are intended to qualify. See the latter ἵνα both in 1 Cor. ix. 15, and 2 Cor. ii. 4; also Gal. ii. 10, and εἰ in 1 Cor. xv. 2.—It is worthy of note that the Apostle does not say in reference to the Gentiles, 'through your *obedience* or *faithfulness* they may obtain mercy,' which his antithesis might seem to require; but, "through your *mercy*," that is, 'through the favour which has been shown to you.' Perhaps his intention was to avoid language which might tend to raise the Gentiles too much in their own estimation, and at the same time to remind them of their obligation to God's mercy for the benefits of the Gospel.

"God hath concluded:" The merely English reader must not suppose that this word has here any logical force. The marginal reading, "shut up together," the translation of Wiclif, "closid to gidre," that of Tyndale, Cranmer and the Genevan, "wrapped in," give the meaning of the original, which is also etymologically expressed by the English word in its old sense as derived from *cum* and *claudo*.—Macknight translates thus: "God

now obtained mercy through their	ποτε ἠπειθήσατε τῷ θεῷ, νῦν δὲ
31 unbelief; even so have these also	ἐλεήθητε τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ·
now not believed, that through your	οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι νῦν ἠπείθησαν, 31
mercy they also may obtain mercy.	τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ
32 For God hath concluded them all	ἐλεηθῶσι. Συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ 32
in unbelief, that he might have	θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπείθειαν,
33 mercy upon all. O the depth of	ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ. Ὡ 33
the riches both of the wisdom and	βάθους πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ
knowledge of God! How unsearch-	γνώσεως θεοῦ· ὥς ἀνεξερεύνητα

hath shut up together all (under sentence of death) *for* disobedience.” To prove that *εἰς ἀπείθειαν* does not mean *in* unbelief, but *for* disobedience, he refers to the use of *εἰς* in Mark i. 4, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Thess. i. 11. But, although the English word *for* expresses the sense of *εἰς* in these places; yet the idea which it conveys is plainly different from that which Mac-knight intends in this verse. He must mean, *in consequence of*; whereas in the places referred to *εἰς* means either, *in order to procure*, or, *for the benefit of*, or, *so as to permit* a result. The references therefore are not parallel. This is not the only instance in which this commentator errs in the same way. On Phil. iv. 15, he translates *ἀπό* *in*, a meaning which it never bears, but which he attempts to sustain by the phrase *ἀπὸ μέρους*, rendered in English by ‘*in part*,’ referring also to his fourth preliminary Essay, No. 86, where he quotes these words from 2 Cor. i. 14. Such a philological criticism could hardly be expected from a scholar of his reputation. He argues in favour of his view of *εἰς*, that “while a man is shut up in unbelief or disobedience, that is, while he is made to continue in unbelief, he is not an object of mercy, neither can he receive the Gospel.” But this is not the meaning of the phrase. The true sense may be illustrated by Gal. iii. 22, “the Scripture hath concluded, shut up, all under sin,” where the Greek verb is the same as here. To shut up under or to another, is to subject to his control. Thus we read in Deut. xxxii. 30, “the Lord had shut them up;” and in Ps. xxxi. 8, (in the Sept. xxx. 9, where the Greek word is the same as that employed by the Apostle,) “hast not shut me up into the hand of the enemy.” The literal meaning then of the clauses in the two epistles is this: ‘God hath subjected all men to unbelief,’ or, ‘the Scripture hath subjected all men to sin;’ meaning that it declares, or that God in Scripture declares this to be their natural state and he so regards them. It is not affirmed that God produces this condition. Either he is represented as allowing it, or the verbs are declarative. The latter view would accord with usage. Thus we have “hath made old” for ‘hath declared to be so,’ in Heb. viii. 13.—The last clause of the verse is not to be understood individually but collectively, like “all Israel” in ver. 26.

τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεξιχνύ-
 34 αστοὶ αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ. Τίς γὰρ
 ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; ἢ τίς σύμ-
 35 βουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο; ἢ τίς
 προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδο-
 36 θήσεται αὐτῷ; Ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ
 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ
 πάντα· αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς
 αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

able *are* his judgments, and his
 ways past finding out! For who 34
 hath known the mind of the Lord?
 or who hath been his counsellor?
 or who hath first given to him, and 35
 it shall be recompensed unto him
 again? For of him, and through 36
 him, and to him, *are* all things: to
 whom *be* glory for ever. Amen.

33-36. Some ancient authorities omit the first *καί*. Among them is the Vulgate which translates, O altitudo divitiarum sapientiæ et scientiæ Dei. Commentators differ on this point: whether the three nouns which immediately follow *depth* express three distinct ideas, or whether this word and *riches* merely denote the profundity and vastness of what is comprehended under the other two. According to the latter view, the Apostle will utter his feeling of amazement at the immeasurable and incomprehensible greatness of God's wisdom and knowledge, and the first *καί* will be rendered *both*. The former view retains the usual meaning of the copulative, and regards *riches* as equivalent to *abundant favour* or *love*. Although this word is most frequently employed in immediate connection with some other to which it adds force, as in Rom. ii. 4, ix. 23, 2 Cor. viii. 2, Eph. i. 7, 18, and many other places; yet it is also employed independently, as in Eph. iii. 8 and Phil. iv. 19. Thus St. Paul will burst out in admiration of God's profound love and wisdom and knowledge, as displayed in the Gospel scheme of salvation. Either of these views harmonizes with other places, and agrees with the meaning of the Greek. The one just stated, being the fullest, is perhaps on that account to be preferred. But the argument in favour of it which is drawn by Olshausen from the particular adaptation of the phrases that follow to the three points respectively, and also from the three prepositions in ver 36, does not appear to have much force.

The quotation in the next verses is from Isa. xl. 13, 14, with an allusion to Job xli. 11, (Heb. 3.) The sentiment which they contain is evidently this: The purposes of God are beyond the reach of finite intellect or influence. The idea in the last verse may be expressed as follows: From God all things are produced, by him they subsist, and to his glory they tend. The subject of the Apostle's doxology is undoubtedly God, the Holy Trinity, and the prepositions which he employs are entirely in harmony with scriptural usage in distinct reference to the three persons. But inasmuch as they are also employed in reference to God comprehensively considered, there is not sufficient reason to suppose a distinction of the persons to be thereby particularly intended.

SECTION XII.

CHAPS. XII.—XVI.

THE PRACTICAL PART OF THE EPISTLE.

- XII. I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, *which is your reasonable service.*
- 2 And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.
- 3 For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of *himself* more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the
- 4 measure of faith. For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office;
- 5 so we, *being many*, are one body in
- Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, XII.
διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ,
παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν
θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον
τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν
ὑμῶν. Καὶ μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε 2
τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ μετα-
μορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ
νοῦ ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν
ὑμᾶς, τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ,
τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ
τέλειον. Λέγω γὰρ διὰ τῆς 3
χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι παντὶ
τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν, μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν
παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν
εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἐκάστῳ ὡς ὁ
θεὸς ἐμέρισε μέτρον πίστεως.
Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι μέλη 4
πολλὰ ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα
οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πρᾶξιν, οὕτως 5

As the leading topics of the Epistle are discussed at length in the preceding chapters, and those which follow are chiefly confined to what is hortatory and practical, the notes shall be few and in general brief.

CHAP. xii. 2. "That ye may prove:" Either, have proof of by experience, or, give proof of by example. Probably both are comprehended. Comp. Eph. v. 10, Phil. i. 10.

3. "The grace given unto me:" That is, through the Apostolic gift and authority with which he had been graciously entrusted. Comp. i. 5.—"Measure of faith:" In other words, the degree of faithful character. This is, in every believer, the gift of God.

4, 5. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 12.—With ὁ δὲ καθ' εἷς, *and every one*, comp. 3 Macc. v. 34, ὁ καθ' εἷς δὲ τῶν φίλων, *but every one of his friends*; also Mark xiv. 19, John viii. 9, and Rev. xxi. 21.

6. "Prophecy:" The word here means the gift of prophesying, that is, of speaking in the authority of God and under divine influence. The idea

<p>οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὁ δὲ καθ' εἰς ἀλλήλων 6 μέλη. Ἐχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κα- τὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα· εἴτε προφητείαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως· 7 εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ· εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκα- 8 λίᾳ· εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει· ὁ μεταδιδούς, ἐν ἀπλότῃτι· ὁ προϊστάμενος, ἐν σπουδῇ· ὁ ἐλεῶν, ἐν ἰλαρότῃτι.</p>	<p>Christ, and every one members one of another. Having then gifts dif- 6 fering according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy <i>let us prophesy</i> according to the pro- portion of faith; or ministry, <i>let us</i> 7 <i>wait on our</i> ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that 8 exhorteth, on exhortation. He that giveth, <i>let him do it</i> with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerful-</p>
---	---

of predicting future events is not an essential element in the signification of the word. Prophecy may be prediction, or it may be nothing more than instruction, declaration, exhortation, warning communicated under divine direction and influence. The proper and probably the original meaning of the word prophet is, one who speaks as God's substitute or ambassador. Thus it is said of Moses, "I have made thee a *god* to Pharaoh, and Aaron shall be thy *prophet*;" of which the language that precedes is explanatory: "He shall be thy *spokesman* unto the people; he shall be to thee *instead of a mouth*, and thou shalt be to him *instead of God*:" Exod. vii. 1, iv. 16. To the same purpose we read in Jer. xv. 19: "If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be *as my mouth*." The two words anciently used for prophet by the Greeks, *προφήτης* and *ὑποφήτης*, seem to be nearly equivalent, meaning one who speaks *for, before, or under*, that is, *in the place of another*. This is undoubtedly the signification of the term where it first occurs in the Bible, in the narrative of Abraham's residence with Abimelech. The Almighty warns the king of Gerar in a dream not to injure the Patriarch, adding, "for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live:" Gen. xx. 7. He is thus declared to be a sacred personage, the interpreter of God, speaking as his agent. This is also a very usual sense of the word in the New Testament. A prophet is a messenger of God, divinely inspired, directed and commissioned to communicate his will to men, to extend the knowledge of his character, and thus to advance his glory.

"According to the proportion of faith:" This clause, rendered, 'according to the analogy of the faith,' has been supposed to convey this meaning: 'so as to harmonize with the general scheme of religion as revealed in the New Testament.' Under the guidance of this principle, theological opinions have been formed and moulded, and bodies of divinity composed, the authors of which have been exceedingly careful not to introduce anything in opposition to certain systems which they suppose to constitute the essential substance of Christian doctrine. Perhaps few principles have exercised

9	ness. <i>Let</i> love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil;	Ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος · ἀποστν- 9 γοῦντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλώμενοι
10	cleave to that which is good. <i>Be</i> kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour pre-	τῷ ἀγαθῷ · τῇ φιλαδελφία εἰς 10 ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι · τῇ τιμῇ
11	ferring one another; not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving	ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι · τῇ 11 σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί · τῷ πνεύ-
12	the Lord; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; continuing instant	ματι ζέοντες · τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύ- οντες · τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες · τῇ 12 θλίψει ὑπομένοντες · τῇ προσ-
13	in prayer; distributing to the necessity of saints; given to hospi-	ευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες · ταῖς 13 χρείαις τῶν ἀγίων κοινωνοῦν-
14	tality. Bless them which persecute	τες · τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες.
15	you; bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and	Εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς · 14 εὐλογεῖτε, καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε.

greater influence than this on scriptural interpretation. It has diminished, modified, and added to revealed truth, at pleasure. Doubtless there is a oneness in the New Testament revelation, all the parts of which not only cohere, but are also in perfect unison; so that an interpretation which shall represent different passages as conflicting in doctrinal statement must necessarily be erroneous. But to assume the infallible truth of a system of doctrine independently of Scripture, and then to bring the tenets of such system as a criterion of the meaning of Scripture, is to set up an unauthorised rule of faith. Careful philological and exegetical examination will prove that such a supposed safeguard is unnecessary, and experience and observation show it to be injurious. Neither does the principle receive any support from the words of the text. "The proportion of faith" is equivalent to "the measure of faith" in ver. 3, and simply means, the degree of the divinely imparted gift. The reader may find some useful remarks on this subject in Campbell's fourth Dissertation preliminary to his Translation of the Gospels, Section 13. Compare also Ernesti on Interpretation, Stuart's Translation, Sect. 34, p. 17, and Morus, Par. 1, Sect. i. xix. pp. 70, 71, and Sect. ii. Cap. iii. xvi-xviii., pp. 253-259, and Locke in loc., note (h).

Olshausen agrees with Griesbach in reading *καιρῷ* for *κυρίῳ*. He admits that the latter reading, which is also the received, "has by far the greater support from authorities," but still decides in favour of the former on the ground of internal evidence, remarking that a charge so entirely general as 'to serve the Lord,' is out of place among such altogether special exhortations." Such an argument has no great force, for the phrase immediately preceding, "fervent in spirit," that is, ardent, zealous in mind, (comp. Acts xviii. 25,) is of very general application; and indeed so also is the exhortation which arises from the reading he prefers, "serving the time,"

15 Χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων καὶ	weep with them that weep. Be of 16
16 κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. Τὸ	the same mind one toward another.
αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες·	Mind not high things, but con-
μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες, ἀλλὰ	descend to men of low estate. Be
τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι·	not wise in your own conceits. Re- 17
μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυ-	compense to no man evil for evil.
17 ταῖς. Μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ	Provide things honest in the sight
ἀποδιδόντες· προνοοῦμενοι κα-	of all men. If it be possible, as 18
λὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων.	much as lieth in you, live peaceably
18 Εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, μετὰ	with all men. Dearly beloved, 19
πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες·	avenge not yourselves; but <i>rather</i>
19 μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπη-	give place unto wrath: for it is
τοί, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ·	written, Vengeance is mine; I will
γέγραπται γάρ· ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις,	repay, saith the Lord. Therefore 20

which means, either yielding to uncontrollable circumstances, or, wisely availing one's self of any opportunity of Christian usefulness. Eph. v. 16 is not exactly parallel, as there the reading is, *ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρόν*, which appears to be borrowed from Dan. ii. 8. Olshausen allows too that the phrase 'to serve the time' is not found in Greek before the second century, though frequently occurring in Latin. The other, 'to serve the Lord,' is very common.

14. Comp. Matt. v. 44.

15. The infinitive is used in the sense of the imperative.

16, first clause: Comp. Phil. ii. 2.—“Condescend:” *συναπαγόμενοι* literally, ‘being led away along with,’ equivalent to, ‘allowing yourselves to be associated or connected with, willingly yielding to.’—“To men of low estate:” *τοῖς ταπεινοῖς*. This may be masculine, as in our translation, and the meaning will be, conforming to, associating and sympathizing with the humble; or it may be neuter and express the duty of a willing acquiescence in humble and lowly circumstances. The antithesis with the neuter “high things,” favours this view, but the compounded preposition *σύν* agrees better with the other.

17. “Providing things honest:” Literally ‘providing’ or ‘taking care for good things.’ The meaning is, carefully and earnestly endeavouring to do what is right. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 21, and Prov. iii. 4.

19. “Give place unto:” We have the same phrase in Luke xiv. 9, “give this man place;” that is, yield position or precedence to him: also in Eph. iv. 27, “neither give place to the devil;” meaning, do not submit to him. The words never elsewhere occur in the New Testament. Analogy therefore would suggest this exposition: yield to wrath, allow it to have its rightful sway. In this case the wrath must be understood of God, as is done by several commentators, both in accordance with the former clause

if thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him drink : for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of 21 fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.	<i>ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει κύριος.</i> <i>Ἐὰν οὖν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου, 20</i> <i>ψώμιζε αὐτόν· ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε</i> <i>αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν ἀνδρα-</i> <i>κας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν</i> <i>κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. Μὴ νικῶ ὑπὸ 21</i> <i>τοῦ κακοῦ, ἀλλὰ νίκα ἐν τῷ</i> <i>ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν.</i>
---	---

of the verse, and also with the quotation from Deut. xxxii. 35, which follows. The sentiment will then be this : Give way to the just anger of God, and be not solicitous to vindicate yourselves by inflicting punishment. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 23. But the omission of God, the principal party, is unnatural, and the first clause of the verse affords quite a sufficient antithesis to the statement of the quotation.—If the wrath be referred to the offender, the meaning may be, ‘yield by avoiding it,’ and the direction will be prudential.—If it be that of the injured person, the meaning of the phrase cannot be as above given, for this would manifestly be the very reverse of the Apostle’s intention. He cannot possibly exhort the Christian to indulge in angry passion. Adhering to the literal meaning of the words and yet applying them according to the nature of the injunction, we may interpret the clause thus : Give room to, that is, space, opportunity to depart. The exhortation is, not merely to defer the indulgence or exercise of anger, but not at all to retain it ; to give it free egress, to abandon it, and yield our cause to the righteous God.

20, 21. The quotation is from Prov. xxv. 21, 22. It is very like the language in 2 Esdras xvi. 54 : “ God shall burn coals of fire upon his head which saith before the Lord God and his glory, I have not sinned.” The idea prominent in these passages is evidently that of severe penal suffering. This is expressed by the words themselves, and the antithetic clause in Proverbs, “ the Lord shall reward thee,” which immediately follows the quotation, confirms this result. The pain of penitence, arising from a consciousness of having done wrong, is no doubt comprehended. Such places as 2 Sam. xiv. 7, are wholly irrelevant, as they only show that the figure of a coal may be employed in illustration of what is desirable and valued. The authors of the Proverbs and the Epistle both refer undoubtedly to the proper punishment of the offender. But it cannot be proved that either has in view the gratification of private passion in such punishment. They speak of it rather as resulting in the repentance of the guilty person, who, being suitably chastised, is converted through the kindness of the injured party. And it may be well to note that this motive appears even in some of the imprecatory Psalms. See lxxxiii. 16, cix. 27 ; and compare 1 Cor. v. 5, and 1 Tim. i. 20. And even if such should not be

XIII. Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπε-
 χούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω· οὐ γάρ
 ἐστὶν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ
 δὲ οὖσαι [ἐξουσίαι] ὑπὸ θεοῦ
 2 τεταγμέναι εἰσὶν. Ὡστε ὁ ἀντι-
 τασσόμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῇ τοῦ
 θεοῦ διαταγῇ ἀνθέστηκεν· οἱ δὲ
 ἀνθεστηκότες ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λή-
 3 ψονται. Οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ
 εἰσὶ φόβος τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων,
 ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν· θέλεις δὲ μὴ
 φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ

Let every soul be subject unto XIII.
 the higher powers. For there is no
 power but of God; the powers that
 be are ordained of God. Whosoever 2
 therefore resisteth the power, resist-
 eth the ordinance of God; and they
 that resist shall receive to themselves
 damnation. For rulers are not a ter- 3
 ror to good works, but to the evil.
 Wilt thou then not be afraid of the
 power? do that which is good and
 thou shalt have praise of the same;

the result, nothing more can be intended than a degree of punishment necessary to vindicate the divine law. From this passage no inference to sanction private passion can be drawn which might not be drawn from the former verse and also from others. Comp. Ps. xciv., 2 Tim. iv. 14, and other similar places. The Apostle exhorts us to resign to God the office of punishing, and to endeavour through love and acts of kindness to conquer our enemies, and thus to bring them to repentance and a change of character.

xiii. 1, 2. The tendency of the Jews to rebellion illustrates the propriety of these precepts, which were also calculated to show unconverted Roman citizens, that the nature of Christianity was in no respect hostile to civil government. Legitimate authority is of course intended. But neither our Lord nor his Apostles ever determined what it is that makes civil authority legitimate, further than a settled government. The established, recognised government is authoritative, and it is in reference to such a one that their precepts are laid down. What form such government may rightly take or have taken, is one of the questions which the New Testament ignores. Neither does it enter into the question of the citizen's rights or duty during the process of a revolution, when political and civil affairs are in a transition state.—Government is not dependent on human will; it is God's institution; and whatever form man's inclination and action may give to it, is given under the permission of his superintending providence, and therefore to be regarded as authoritative. All human authority, even the very highest, must yield to that of God, whom "we ought to obey rather than men:" Acts v. 29. But it is the duty of every man to satisfy his mind by careful and conscientious examination respecting this highest of all laws, before he presumes to place what he thinks to be demanded by it in contradistinction to the legal enactments of the legitimate authority of his country.

3. This expresses what the ruler ought and is presumed to be. The Apostle rather describes the nature of the office than the character of those

- 4 for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to *execute* wrath upon him
 5 that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake.
 6 For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very
 7 thing. Render, therefore, to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom
 ἀγαθὸν ποίει, καὶ ἔξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς· θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονος 4
 ἐστὶ σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, φοβοῦ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ· θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν, ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι.
 Διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, οὐ 5
 μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν. Διὰ τοῦτο 6
 γὰρ καὶ φόρους τελεῖτε· λειτουργοὶ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσιν εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκαρτεροῦντες. Ἀπό- 7
 δοτε οὖν πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς· τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον· τῷ τὸ τέλος τὸ τέλος· τῷ τὸν φόβον

who may exercise its functions. It is worthy of admiration that, writing on such a subject and under such a government as that of Nero, he could so restrain himself as to present general principles and abstract truths, without saying one word in the way of limitation or restraint. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion, that he felt himself to be writing for the benefit of mankind in all future ages, and under the influence of a superhuman power.

7. Φόρος means tax or tribute; τέλος duties, property tax paid for the support of the state; φόβος and τιμή, reverence and honour to superiors.

8. "Owe:" Some prefer the indicative translation of the verb: 'you owe' &c., that is, the circle of your duties comprises nothing more than love. But the meaning given by the imperative is more probable, as it accords better with the preceptive nature of the context. The sentiment is: Let nothing be due from you but love, always regard yourselves as under obligation to cultivate mutual affection; this debt can never be fully paid.—"Fulfilled:" Comp. ver. 10. The use of this word to express sincere obedience, though it be imperfect, may illustrate the language in viii. 4.

9. "If there be any other:" That is, whatever other there may be. Comp. Eph. iv. 29, Phil. iv. 8.

11, 12. "And this:" Most commentators suppose an ellipsis. Ammon adds, "ye are the rather bound to;" referring to the duty just inculcated. Macknight understands, "I command," making it the introduction of another precept. Grotius and after him Rosenmueller render it, "especially, so much the more;" Erasmus supplies, "when ye know," remarking that it strengthens the appeal: compare καὶ ταῦτα in 1 Cor. vi. 8.

<p>τὸν φόβον· τῷ τὴν τιμὴν τὴν 8 τιμὴν. Μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε, εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν· ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον 9 πεπλήρωκε. Τὸ γάρ· οὐ μοι- χεύσεις· οὐ φονεύσεις· οὐ κλέψεις· οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις· καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, ἐν τῷ· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου 10 ὡς ἐαυτόν. Ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλη- σίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται· πλή- 11 ρωμα οὖν νόμον ἡ ἀγάπη. Καὶ τοῦτο, εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι ᾠρα ἡμᾶς ἤδη ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆ- ναι· νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ</p>	<p>honour. Owe no man any thing, but 8 to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit 9 adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet, and if <i>there be</i> any other command- ment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love 10 worketh no ill to his neighbour, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. And that, knowing the time, 11 that now <i>it is</i> high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salva-</p>
---	--

Olshausen adds "so much the more."—Here Koppe remarks that St. Paul, in order to urge his readers to the practice of the Christian virtues, adds this consideration: "that the return of Christ to earth was not remote, and that it would be accompanied by the tokens of a better and happier life." He refers to his Excursus II. on Thessalonians* to show "that the Apostles themselves, through the wise permission of divine Providence, cherished the opinion and hope of Christ's speedy return." Locke too expresses the same sentiment. "It seems by these two verses, as if St. Paul looked upon Christ's coming as not far off, to which there are several other occurrent passages in his epistles. See 1 Cor. i. 17." In opposition to this opinion the reader is referred to Whitby's note on 2 Thess. iv. 15, and his "Discourse by way of inquiry" &c. appended to his annotations on 2nd Thessalonians. Neither this passage, nor any other in the Apostle's writings, is sufficiently definite to prove that he entertained such a view, while others are not at all reconcilable with the theory. What he says in the 11th chapter respecting the present condition and future prospects of the Israelites, seems to imply that he expected a considerable space of time to elapse before the consummation of the events there spoken of, which, nevertheless, must take place anterior to Christ's second coming. And in his second epistle to the Thessalonians he expressly guards them against such a misconstruction of his sentiments. The view of Macknight and Rosenmueller that "salvation" refers to the doctrine of the Gospel, and that it has been brought "nearer" to the mind, that is, is better understood and appreciated by the advanced Christian than it could be immediately after conversion, is feeble and improbable; neither do the places quoted establish

* See pp. 115 et seq.

- tion nearer than when we believed.
- 12 The night is far spent, the day is at hand : let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put
- 13 on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly, as in the day ; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in
- 14 strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to *fulfil* the lusts *thereof*.
- XIV. Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, *but* not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that
- 2 he may eat all things : another,
- σωτηρίᾳ, ἣ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν. Ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα 12 ἤγγικεν · ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους καὶ ἐνδυσώμεθα τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός. Ὡς 13 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις, μὴ ἐριδι καὶ ζήλῳ · ἀλλ' ἐνδύσασθε τὸν 14 κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας.
- Τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ XIV. πίστει προσλαμβάνεσθε, μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν. Ὃς μὲν 2 πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, ὁ δὲ

such a meaning of the words. "Salvation" signifies here most probably the happiness on which the Christian enters immediately after death, and "night" in ver. 12, the present state of ignorance, sinfulness, and consequent unhappiness. Although the figure of night and day is strikingly descriptive of the condition of man before the reception of the Gospel and after, yet it is equally applicable to the Christian's present and future condition. In this view it is here employed, and St. Paul is looking forward to the hour of death, as that which introduces future felicity. Thus, "nearer" will retain its usual meaning. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 6-8.

13. The Apostle refers to inordinate gratification of the appetite, to licentious indulgence, and such passionate contentions as are their almost invariable attendants.

14. "Put on : " The figure expresses the idea of being imbued with the character of Christ. See the note on vi. 3, p. 97.

xiv. In the Apostolic age, asceticism prevailed considerably among a certain class of heathen philosophers, and also particularly among the Essene Jews. This would, of course, exert an influence on the character and condition of some of the converts to Christianity. The feeling which governed weak consciences in reference to the right or propriety of using meats which had been publicly exhibited for sale, lest they should previously have been offered in sacrifice to idols, prevailed to a considerable degree. See the Apostle's directions on this particular point in 1 Cor. viii. x. 25 et seq. And, attachment to abrogated Jewish rites still lingered in the minds of many. All these circumstances were doubtless in view when the Apostle prepared the directions here embodied ; and which apply, in a greater or less degree, to the various classes concerned, while they will

- 3 ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει. Ὁ who is weak, eateth herbs. Let 3
ἐσθίων τὸν μὴ ἐσθίοντα μὴ not him that eateth despise him
ἐξουθενεῖτω, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων that eateth not; and let not him
τὸν ἐσθίοντα μὴ κρινέτω. ὁ which eateth not judge him that
θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο. eateth: for God hath received him.
- 4 Σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον Who art thou that judgest another 4
οἰκέτην; τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει man's servant? to his own master
ἢ πίπτει. σταθήσεται δέ. δυ- he standeth or falleth. Yea, he
νατὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς στῆσαι shall be holden up; for God is able
5 αὐτόν. Ὁς μὲν κρίνει ἡμέραν to make him stand. One man es- 5
παρ' ἡμέραν, ὃς δὲ κρίνει πᾶσαν teemeth one day above another;
ἡμέραν. ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῦ another esteemeth every day *alike*.
- 6 πληροφορεῖσθω. Ὁ φρονῶν τὴν Let every man be fully persuaded
ἡμέραν κυρίῳ φρονεῖ, καὶ ὁ μὴ in his own mind. He that regard- 6
φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίῳ οὐ eth the day, regardeth *it* unto the
φρονεῖ. καὶ ὁ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ Lord; and he that regardeth not

always remain to the Christian church in all future ages wise and practical principles directing its procedure in all indifferent matters. The general tenour of his remarks, and the respectful manner in which he refers to the class of persons indicated, prove that he has particularly in view the weak and scrupulous consciences of pious persons, somewhat under the control of education and former habits. Towards these he directs that a kind, forbearing, and conciliatory course should be pursued. His remarks are distinguished by a meekness and wisdom both admirable and characteristic.

Ver. 1. "Receive:" That is, with kindness and respect, not embarrassing with difficulties, but rather helping and supporting. The same verb is used in ver. 3 of God, and in xv. 7 of affectionate and friendly reception of each other, and of Christ's favour to us.—"Doubtful disputations:" Either, literally, "not to judgments of thoughts, that is, not so as to make oneself the judge of their thoughts and scruples:"* or, 'not to distinctions of thoughts' or 'discussions,' that is, not so as to encourage nice discriminations and distinctions in points of opinion which in themselves are really of but little importance. When will the Christian church learn to imbibe the deep yet simple wisdom of this great and good man?

4. What a depth of intellectual character and moral feeling is here! You man, do you presume to pass sentence in the case of another's servant? What know you of its various circumstances? Have you taken the pains to ascertain them all? Are you even certain that you have the ability to do so? And if you have mastered the facts, can you put them all in the right balance and weigh them all with the most scrupulous accuracy, so as

* Robinson Lex.

- the day, to the Lord he doth not regard *it*. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth
- 7 God thanks. For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to
- 8 himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die,
- 9 we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord
- 10 both of the dead and living. But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.
- 11 For it is written, *As I live*, saith the Lord every knee shall bow to
- ἐσθίει· εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ θεῷ· καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει, καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ θεῷ. Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτῷ ζῇ, καὶ 7 οὐδεὶς ἑαυτῷ ἀποθνήσκει· ἐάν 8 τε γὰρ ζῶμεν, τῷ κυρίῳ ζῶμεν, ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκομεν· ἐάν τε οὖν ζῶμεν, ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμέν. Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς 9 ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἔζησεν, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ. Σὺ δέ, τί κρίνεις τὸν 10 ἀδελφόν σου; ἢ καὶ σὺ, τί ἐξουθενεῖς τὸν ἀδελφόν σου; πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Γέγραπται γάρ· 11 ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ. Ἄρα οὖν ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ 12

to bring out the right result? It is possible. But the Apostle intimates the only sensible course. Yield the decision to God. "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Each man's own conscience must, after all that has been said, influence him. Of course, his conscience must be rightly taught, regulated and directed. Then the divine precept applies: "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind."

7-9. Here we have the reason of the directions before given, namely, that every true Christian, in imitation of his master, is devoted to the welfare of his fellows. It is not his own gratification, but their good, which he seeks.

11, 12. The quotation is from Isa. xlv. 23, and agrees very nearly with the Septuagint. The prophet is speaking of the dissemination of true religion by means of the Gospel. He predicts the approaching period when all mankind will reject the worship of idols, and acknowledge and adore the only true God. St. Paul applies the text to the concluding act of Christ's mediatorial authority, the exercise of his judicial office. This is comprehended within the prophet's more general idea of submission and allegiance, which are ultimately to be universally rendered to Christ.

13. The word "judge" is here employed in different meanings; first, in that of *censuring*, *condemning*, and then of *resolving*. The figure is called *antanaclasis*, meaning, a repetition of the same word in a different sense. See Glassii *Philologia Sacra* his temporibus accommodata a D. Jo. Aug.

- ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ θεῷ.
 13 Μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν·
 ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ
 μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ
 14 ἢ σκάνδαλον. Οἶδα καὶ πέπεισ-
 μαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι οὐδὲν
 κοινὸν δι' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογι-
 ζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ
 15 κοινόν. Εἰ δὲ διὰ βρώμα ὁ
 ἀδελφός σου λυπεῖται, οὐκέτι
 κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς· μὴ τῷ
 βρώματί σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε,
 16 ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε. Μὴ
 βλασφημεῖσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγα-
 17 θόν. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία
 τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ
 δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ
 18 ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ· ὁ γὰρ ἐν
 τούτοις δουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ
- me and every tongue shall confess
 to God. So then every one of us 12
 shall give account of himself to God.
 Let us not therefore judge one an- 13
 other any more; but judge this
 rather, that no man put a stumbling-
 block or an occasion to fall in *his*
 brother's way. I know, and am 14
 persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that
there is nothing unclean of itself;
 but to him that esteemeth any
 thing to be unclean, to him *it is*
 unclean. But if thy brother be 15
 grieved with *thy* meat, now walk-
 est thou not charitably. Destroy
 not him with thy meat, for whom
 Christ died. Let not then your 16
 good be evil spoken of. For the 17
 kingdom of God is not meat and
 drink; but righteousness, and peace,
 and joy in the Holy Ghost. For 18

Dathio, Lib. II. Tract. II. Cap. iii. Tom. I. pp. 1342 et seq. Compare also *φθείρει* and *φθερεῖ* in 1 Cor. iii. 17, and the *κριταὶ* with *διεκρίθητε* in James ii. 4.

14. Comp. Tit. i. 15.

15. "Destroy:" That is, do not set such an example as may tend to the ruin of one whom Christ died to redeem; do not expose him to the danger of destruction, by leading him to do what his conscience condemns.

16. "Your good:" Either the Christian religion which you profess; according to many both ancient and modern expositors: or, the right freedom of Christian character which you have attained; according to other weighty authorities. Either exposition gives a good sense, and agrees with the context; although the latter is perhaps to be preferred. Compare 1 Cor. x. 29, 30, where the sentiment is the same: 'Why should I so use my Christian liberty as to expose it to censure and condemnation by another conscience than my own? Why should I injudiciously expose myself to calumny on account of what I am thankful for?'

17. "The kingdom of God:" This phrase—which generally denotes the religious dispensation as established by the divine Messiah, limited occasionally to its imperfect condition on earth and occasionally to its glorious condition in Heaven, but frequently comprehending both these states—is sometimes, as here, employed to express the character of the dispensation

he that in these things serveth Christ, *is* acceptable to God, and
 19 approved of men. Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things where-
 20 with one may edify another. For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed *are* pure; but *it* is evil for that man who eateth
 21 with offence. *It is* good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor *any thing* whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is
 22 made weak. Hast thou faith? have *it* to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he al-
 23 loweth. And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because *he eateth* not of faith: for whatsoever *is* not of faith is sin.

εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ καὶ δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Ἄρα οὖν τὰ 19 τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους. Μὴ 20 ἕνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ. Πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ· ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίοντι. Καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα, 21 μὴδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον, μὴδὲ ἐν ᾧ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ. Σὺ πίστιν 22 ἔχεις· κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ· μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει. Ὁ δὲ 23 διακρινόμενος, εἰὰν φάγη, κατακέκριται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.

as spiritual, and consequently removed from whatever is essential to material and temporal existence. Hence our Lord says: "The kingdom of God is within you:" Luke xvii. 21. The characteristic of Christianity is chiefly internal, consisting in righteousness and its accompanying divine satisfactions. The lesson conveyed by these passages is all important, and its truth and deep meaning will be appreciated and felt just in proportion as we learn to understand the sublime elevation of Christianity.

20-23. "The work of God" expresses the Christian character wrought in the soul by divine agency. "With offence:" διὰ προσκόμματος. The preposition expresses the idea of *along with* or *notwithstanding*. Comp. ii. 27 and note there, pp. 41, 42. It is bad for a man to eat, if by so doing he places a stumbling-block in his brother's way.—"Faith" is equivalent to sound conviction of a Christian mind. The Apostle's direction is given to the Christian who is not embarrassed by scruples respecting matters of indifference. He is not to use his liberty so as to endanger the religious character of a weak brother, by setting him an example which he may be induced unlawfully to imitate. 'Although indeed all kinds of food may properly be eaten, yet if by so doing a man induces another to eat against the suggestions of his weak conscience, he becomes the occasion and in some sense the cause of sin; and whoever eats in opposition to his convictions, sins and subjects himself to condemnation.'

Griesbach and a few editors, led by some ancient authorities introduce

- XV. Ὁφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν καὶ μὴ 2
 2 ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν. Ἐκαστος ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς 3
 3 τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν, ἀλλά, καθὼς γέγραπται· οἱ 4
 4 ἐπείπεσον ἐπ' ἐμέ. Ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν προεγράφη, ἵνα διὰ 5
 5 τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν. Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δώη 6
 6 τοῖς κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἵνα ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι δοξά-
 We then that are strong ought XV.
 to bear the infirmities of the weak,
 and not to please ourselves. Let 2
 every one of us please *his* neigh-
 bour for *his* good to edification. For 3
 even Christ pleased not himself; but
 as it is written, The reproaches of
 them that reproached thee fell on
 me. For whatsoever things were 4
 written aforetime were written for
 our learning, that we through
 patience and comfort of the Scrip-
 tures might have hope. Now the 5
 God of patience and consolation
 grant you to be like-minded one to-
 ward another, according to Christ
 Jesus; that ye may with one mind 6
 and one mouth glorify God, even
 the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

the doxology in xvi. 25-27 at the end of this chapter. From the circumstance that it is found in these different connections in certain ancient manuscripts, and also from supposed internal evidence, and its similarity to the doxology which terminates the Epistle of St. Jude, some doubts have been expressed respecting its genuineness. But the objections are of little or no weight, and the best critics agree that its proper position is at the end of the Epistle. The hypothesis of Semler, that the 15th and 16th chapters were not a part of the Epistle as originally written by St. Paul, nor intended for the Romans, but addressed to other persons by the Apostle, and afterwards connected with this Epistle, is examined by Koppe in his second Excursus. As might be supposed, it is wholly destitute of any historical and critical foundation, and depends almost entirely on surmises and conjecture.

xv. 2. 'In endeavouring to gratify one another, let each aim at mutual improvement.'

3. See Ps. lxi. 9, in the Sept. lxviii. 10. The Psalm has an ultimate reference to Christ and his enemies, and is therefore not properly accommodated. The quotation belongs to the third class. See the Commentary on Hebrews, pp. 25, 26.

4. "Of the Scriptures:" That is, arising from the views of religious truth which they present to us.

5. "To be like-minded;" to agree together: Comp. Phil. ii. 2.—"According to Christ:" Elliptical for, according to the will of Christ. Comp. viii. 27.

7 Wherefore receive ye one another,
as Christ also received us, to the
8 glory of God. Now I say that
Jesus Christ was a minister of the
circumcision for the truth of God,
to confirm the promises made unto
9 the fathers; and that the Gentiles
might glorify God for *his* mercy; as
it is written, For this cause I will
confess to thee among the Gentiles,
10 and sing unto thy name. And
again he saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles,
11 with his people. And again, Praise
the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and laud
12 him, all ye people. And again
Esaias saith, There shall be a root
of Jesse, and he that shall rise to
reign over the Gentiles, in him
13 shall the Gentiles trust. Now the
God of hope fill you with all joy
and peace in believing, that ye may
abound in hope, through the power
of the Holy Ghost.

ἀζήτε τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Διὸ 7
προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, κα-
θὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο
ὑμᾶς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ. Λέγω δέ, 8
Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγεν-
ῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας
θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς 9
ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων, τὰ
δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν
θεόν, καθὼς γέγραπται· διὰ
τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν
ἔθνεσι, καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου
ψαλῶ. Καὶ πάλιν λέγει· εὐ- 10
φράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ
αὐτοῦ. Καὶ πάλιν· αἰνεῖτε τὸν 11
κύριον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἐπαι-
έσατε αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ λαοί.
Καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει· ἔσται 12
ἡ ρίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, καὶ ὁ ἀνιστά-
μενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν· ἐπ' αὐτῷ
ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν. Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς 13
ἐλπίδος πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης
χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύ-
ειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν
τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος
ἀγίου.

6. "God, even the Father:" Or, 'the God and Father.' See Eph. i. 3, 17.

8 et seq. "Of the circumcision:" Meaning, of the Jews, as in iii. 30. The Apostle represents Christ as sent, first for the benefit of the Jews, in order to establish God's fidelity by accomplishing the promises made to the patriarchs; and also, in order that the Gentiles should become united with the ancient covenant people, and both join harmoniously in praising God for his goodness in sending the Saviour. The divine purpose of extending Messiah's kingdom among the Gentiles is a prominent idea in his mind. The quotations, which agree very nearly with the Septuagint, are from Ps. xvii. 50, Deut. xxxii. 43, Ps. cxvii. 1, and Isa. xi. 10, according to the notation of Bretinger. In the last passage the general meaning of the Hebrew is preserved, although the version is not literal.

14, 15. "In some sort:" Literally, 'in part.' The Apostle tells the Roman church, that, although in some parts of his Epistle, he has very freely urged right views of Christian truth and duty; yet, he regards their

- 14 Πέπεισμαι δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοὶ ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πληρωμένοι πάσης γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νουθετεῖν. And I myself also am persuaded 14 of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another. Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly 15 Τολμηρότερον δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀπὸ μέρους, ὥς ἐπαναμυνήσκων ὑμᾶς, διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, unto you in some sort, as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given unto me of God, that 16 εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost. I have therefore whereof I 17 ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ. Ἔχω οὖν καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν· οὐ γὰρ τολμήσω λαλεῖν τι ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο Χριστὸς δι' ἐμοῦ εἰς ὑπακοήν any of those things which Christ

religious state as worthy of high commendation. Comp. i. 8, 12. St. Paul had never been at Rome, and this circumstance, together with his well known principle of not intruding into the ministerial sphere of others, might prompt him to express himself in terms explanatory, at least, if not somewhat apologetic. See 18-20.

16. "The minister—ministering:" These words do not express the full force of the original. The former *λειτουργόν*, is indeed a general term denoting a person who performs public services whether civil or ecclesiastical, and both the noun and the corresponding verb are frequently used in the Septuagint of the priests and their services. The latter *ἱεουργοῦντα*, means nothing else than offering a sacrifice, acting as a priest. The whole declaration is a striking and beautiful figure. St. Paul represents himself as a priest of Jesus Christ, acting in this capacity in respect to the Gospel for the benefit of the Gentiles, whom he offers up as an acceptable oblation to God. He employs the same figure in Phil. ii. 17: "If I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith;" that is, 'if I be poured out as a libation upon the sacrifice of your faith and obedience.' The reception of the Gospel by the Philippians, their dedication of themselves thereby to God, is regarded by the Apostle in the light of an acceptable oblation, and his death on account of his efforts in the cause of Christ, as a libation or drink-offering poured out upon it. Isaiah had employed the same metaphorical style in reference to the conversion of the heathen, and it is very probable that our author had his mind upon the passage. "They *shall bring all your brethren for an offering* unto the Lord out of all nations to

hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation: but, as it is written, To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see, and they that have not heard shall understand. For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming to you. But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you; whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you: for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company. But now I go unto Jerusalem, to minister unto the saints. For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them, verily; and their debtors they are. For if the Gen-

έθνῶν, λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, ἐν δυνά- 19
μει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν
δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὥστε
με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ
μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκ-
έναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.
οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον εὐαγγε- 20
λίζεσθαι, οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη
Χριστός, ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον
θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ, ἀλλὰ καθὼς 21
γέγραπται· αἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη
περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄψονται, καὶ οἱ οὐκ
ἀκηκόασιν, συνήσουσι. Διὸ καὶ 22
ἐνεκότητόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ ἐλ-
θεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι 23
τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τού-
τοις, ἐπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλ-
θεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πολλῶν
ἐτῶν, ὥς ἂν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν 24
Σπανίαν, ἐλπίζω διαπορευόμενος
θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν
προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ, ἂν ὑμῶν
πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ.
Νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσα- 25
λὴμ διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις. Εὐ- 26
δόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ
Ἀχαΐα κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασ-
θαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων
τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ. Εὐδόκησαν 27
γάρ, καὶ ὀφείλεται αὐτῶν εἶσιν·
εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν
ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσι
καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουρ-

my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the Lord, as the children of Israel bring an offering in a clean vessel into the house of the Lord. And I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord:" Isa. lxvi. 20, 21. The priest and the offering are alike figurative, and the idea conveyed is that of entire dedication of both to the service of God.

19. "Have fully preached:" This is the proper translation of the word *πεπληρωκέμαι*. It is derived, however, from the context, as is the case in several other instances. See the note on viii. 4, p. 128.

21. See Isa. lii. 15, Sept.

24. This passage expresses St. Paul's intention to go to Spain; but that he accomplished this purpose is uncertain. The supposition that he

28 γῆσαι αὐτοῖς. Τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέ-
 σας, καὶ σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς
 τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον, ἀπελεύσομαι
 29 δι' ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν. Οἶδα
 δέ, ὅτι ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν
 πληρώματι εὐλογίας τοῦ εὐαγγελ-
 λίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐλεύσομαι.
 30 Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ
 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
 καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύμα-
 τος, συναγωνίσασθαί μοι ἐν ταῖς
 προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν
 31 θεόν, ἵνα ῥυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπει-
 θούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, καὶ ἵνα
 ἡ διακονία μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ
 εὐπρόσδεκτος γένηται τοῖς
 32 ἀγίοις· ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἔλθω πρὸς
 ὑμᾶς διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ
 33 συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν. Ὁ δὲ
 θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης μετὰ πάντων
 ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.

XVI. Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοί-
 βην, τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν
 διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν
 2 Κεγχρεαῖς, ἵνα αὐτὴν προσδέξ-
 ησθε ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἀγίων
 καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν
 ὑμῶν χρήζη πρᾶγματι· καὶ γὰρ
 αὐτὴ προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη

tiles have been made partakers of
 their spiritual things, their duty is
 also to minister unto them in carnal
 things. When, therefore, I have 28
 performed this, and have sealed
 to them this fruit, I will come
 by you into Spain. And I am 29
 sure that, when I come unto you, I
 shall come in the fulness of the
 blessing of the gospel of Christ.
 Now I beseech you, brethren, for 30
 the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and
 for the love of the Spirit, that ye
 strive together with me in *your*
 prayers to God for me; that I may 31
 be delivered from them that do not
 believe in Judea; and that my ser-
 vice which *I have* for Jerusalem
 may be accepted of the saints;
 that I may come unto you with joy 32
 by the will of God, and may with
 you be refreshed. Now the God of 33
 peace *be* with you all. Amen.

I commend unto you Phebe XVI.
 our sister, which is a servant of the
 church which is at Cenchrea; that 2
 ye receive her in the Lord, as be-
 cometh saints, and that ye assist
 her in whatsoever business she hath
 need of you: for she hath been a
 succourer of many, and of myself

did, assumes the theory of a second imprisonment at Rome, and rests chiefly on a passage of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 5. The theory is doubtful, and the text of Clement obscure.

28. "Sealed to them this fruit:" In other words, secured this benefit to them.

xvi. It may be thought extraordinary that St. Paul should send so many salutations as this chapter contains to individuals in a city which he had never visited. But it must be remembered that Rome was a place of general resort, and several of the persons here mentioned may not have been permanent residents of the great metropolis, and have become known to the Apostle elsewhere; and also that several were, in all probability, not personal acquaintances, but known to him solely from their Christian character.

- 3 also. Greet Priscilla and Aquila, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐμοῦ. Ἀσπάσασθε 3
 4 my helpers in Christ Jesus; who Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν, τοὺς συν-
 have for my life laid down their εργοὺς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,
 necks: unto whom not only I give (οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου 4
 thanks, but also all the churches of τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν,
 5 the Gentiles. Likewise greet the οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ,
 church that is in their house. Salute ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι
 my well beloved Epenetus, who is τῶν ἐθνῶν,) καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον 5
 the first-fruits of Achaia unto αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. Ἀσπάσασθε
 6 Christ. Greet Mary who bestowed Ἐπαίνετον, τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου,
 7 much labour on us. Salute And- ὃς ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς
 ronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and Χριστόν. Ἀσπάσασθε Μαριάμ, 6
 my fellow-prisoners, who are of ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ἡμᾶς.
 note among the apostles; who also Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ 7
 8 were in Christ before me. Greet Ἰουνίαν, τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου καὶ
 Amplias, my beloved in the Lord. συναιχμαλώτους μου, οἵτινές
 9 Salute Urbane, our helper in Christ; εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστό-
 10 and Stachys my beloved. Salute λοις, οἳ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γεγόνασιν
 Apelles, approved in Christ. Salute ἐν Χριστῷ. Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀμ- 8
 them which are of Aristobulus' πλίαν, τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου ἐν
 11 household. Salute Herodion my κυρίῳ. Ἀσπάσασθε Οὐρβανόν, 9
 kinsman. Greet them that be of τὸν συνεργὸν ἡμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ,
 the household of Narcissus, which καὶ Στάχυν, τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου.
 Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀπελλῆν, τὸν δόκ- 10
 μου ἐν Χριστῷ. Ἀσπάσασθε
 τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου.
 Ἀσπάσασθε Ἡρωδίωνα, τὸν συγ- 11

3. Comp. Acts xviii. 2, 18, 26, 2 Tim. iv. 19.

4. "Laid down their own necks:" A figure denoting exposure to great danger.

5. "The church that is in their house:" Either, their Christian family; or, more probably, the body of Christians that habitually worshipped at their residence. In the larger cities where the number of converts was considerable, they would be compelled to meet for religious services in private houses, until circumstances allowed them to unite in some one convenient locality.—"Achaia:" The true reading is probably *Asia*, meaning proconsular Asia, as the word is used in Acts ii. 9, of which Ephesus was the capital. Thus the statement here made that Epenetus was the first Christian convert of this province will not conflict with that of 1 Cor. xvi. 15, where "the house of Stephanas" is called "the first-fruits of Achaia."

7. "Of note among the Apostles:" Some explain thus: 'Who are of high estimation with the Apostles, greatly honoured by them.' But, as Tholuck remarks, St. Paul would probably have expressed this idea by some such phrase as, "throughout all the churches." See 2 Cor. viii. 18.

- γενῇ μου. Ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ
τῶν Ναρκίσσου, τοὺς ὄντας ἐν
12 κυρίῳ. Ἀσπάσασθε Τρύφαιναν
καὶ Τρυφῶσαν, τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν
κυρίῳ. Ἀσπάσασθε Περσίδα,
τὴν ἀγαπητὴν, ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκο-
13 πιασεν ἐν κυρίῳ. Ἀσπάσασθε
Ῥοῦφον, τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν κυρίῳ,
καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ.
14 Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀσύγκριτον, Φλέ-
γοντα, Ἑρμᾶν, Πατρόβαν, Ἑρ-
μῆν καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελ-
15 φούς. Ἀσπάσασθε Φιλόλογον
καὶ Ἰουλίαν, Νηρέα καὶ τὴν
ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ Ὀλυμπᾶν
καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας
16 ἁγίους. Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους
ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ. Ἀσπάζονται
ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι τοῦ
Χριστοῦ.
- 17 Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί,
σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας
καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδα-
χὴν, ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε, ποιούν-
τας, καὶ ἐκκλίνετε ἀπ' αὐτῶν.
18 Οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν
Χριστῷ οὐ δουλεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ
- are in the Lord. Salute Tryphena 12
and Tryphosa, who labour in the
Lord. Salute the beloved Persis,
which laboured much in the Lord.
Salute Rufus, chosen in the Lord; 13
and his mother and mine. Salute 14
Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Pat-
robas, Hermes, and the brethren
which are with them. Salute Philo- 15
logus, and Julia, Nereus, and his
sister, and Olympas, and all the
saints which are with them. Salute 16
one another with an holy kiss. The
churches of Christ salute you.
- Now I beseech you, brethren, 17
mark them which cause divisions
and offences contrary to the doc-
trine which ye have learned; and
avoid them. For they that are 18
such serve not our Lord Jesus
Christ, but their own belly; and

The usual translation gives the meaning of the Greek, and probably these persons were apostles, though not in the highest sense of the word. It was certainly applied to others besides the twelve. See Acts xiv. 4, 14, where it is used of Barnabas as well as of St. Paul; also 2 Cor. viii. 23, Phil. ii. 25, and Rev. ii. 2. Compare Bishop White's Lectures on the Church Catechism, Dissertation X. pp. 438-440.

13. "His mother and mine:" This is expressive of deep affection, produced probably by proofs of maternal love shown to the Apostle by the parent of Rufus. Comp. Matt. xii. 49, John xix. 26, and the Iliad, vi. 429, 430.

16. In the primitive church the kiss was a token of peace and mutual Christian affection. Its use was not indiscriminate: but, as we read in the Apostolical Constitutions, "the men saluted one another, and the women those of their own sex." Lib. II. Cap. 57 ad fin. Edit. Coteler. Ant. 1700, vol. i. pp. 264, 265.

19. This suggests a motive to comply with the preceding direction, and thus to maintain the reputation for obedience which had already been

- by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.
- 19 For your obedience is come abroad unto all *men*. I am glad therefore on your behalf: but yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil.
- 20 And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with you. Amen.
- 21 Timotheus my work-fellow, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen, salute you. I Tertius, who wrote *this* epistle, salute you in the
- 23 Lord. Gaius mine host, and of the whole church, saluteth you. Erastus the chamberlain of the city saluteth
- 24 you, and Quartus a brother. The
- τῇ ἐαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ, καὶ διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἐξαπατῶσι τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων. Ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας 19 ἀφίκετο· χαίρω οὖν τὸ ἐφ' ὑμῖν, θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς σοφοὺς μὲν εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν. Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρή- 20 νης συντρίψει τὸν σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν.
- Ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς Τιμόθεος, ὁ 21 συνεργός μου, καὶ Λούκιος καὶ Ἰάσων καὶ Σωσίπατρος, οἱ συγγενεῖς μου. Ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς 22 ἐγὼ Τέρτιος, ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, ἐν κυρίῳ. Ἀσπάζεται 23 ὑμᾶς Γάϊος, ὁ ξένος μου καὶ τῆς

acquired.—“Simple:” Or, inoffensive, “harmless,” as the marginal reading is.

20. This is figurative for, ‘will speedily give you victory over your spiritual foes.’ Some have supposed an allusion to Gen. iii. 15, which is very probable. If so, the Apostle’s mind must have dwelt upon the Hebrew and Chaldee meaning “bruise,” rather than the Septuagint translation ‘watch for.’

21–24. It has been thought strange that St. Paul, after having brought his salutations to an apparent close in ver. 16, and invoked a blessing on the Roman church in ver. 20, should resume the salutations; and that Tertius his amanuensis should interpose his own between two of the author’s. Some critics have inferred that these verses are an appendage not written by the Apostle; others that they were added by him, with the exception of ver. 22, to fill a vacancy in an additional piece of parchment which contained the doxology of vs. 25–27. It is impossible to arrive at any certainty on such points. Some trifling circumstances, unknown to us, may have caused the author to append certain salutations here which would have been more regularly incorporated among the others. It has been conjectured that Tertius was the author of the whole portion from 21 to 24 inclusive. But even then the insertion of his name between those of others still remains unexplained. His salutation may have been originally written in the margin, and at an early age transferred out of place into the text. Or, while writing under the Apostle’s dictation, Tertius may have intro-

ἐκκλησίας ὅλης. Ἀσπάζεται
 ὑμᾶς Ἑραστος, ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς
 πόλεως, καὶ Κούαρτος ὁ ἀδελ-
 24 φός. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν
 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων
 ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.
 25 Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι
 κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου καὶ τὸ
 κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ
 ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις
 26 αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερω-
 θέντος δὲ νῦν, διὰ τε γραφῶν
 προφητικῶν κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ
 αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίσ-
 τεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρι-
 27θέντος, μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ, διὰ
 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς
 τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be*
 with you all. Amen.

Now to him that is of power to 25
 establish you according to my gos-
 pel and the preaching of Jesus
 Christ, according to the revelation
 of the mystery, which was kept
 secret since the world began, but 26
 now is made manifest, and by the
 scriptures of the prophets, accord-
 ing to the commandment of the
 everlasting God, made known to all
 nations for the obedience of faith;
 to God only wise, *be* glory, through 27
 Jesus Christ, for ever. Amen.

duced his own name on account of being, as Tholuck suggests, connected in some way with those just before named.

25. "My Gospel:" Comp. ii. 16 and note, p. 38.—"Since the world began:" Locke, who is followed by Macknight, attempts to explain this phrase of "the times under the law," referring for proof to 2 Tim. i. 9, Tit. i. 2, Luke i. 70, Acts iii. 21, 1 Cor. ii. 7, x. 11, Eph. iii. 9, Col. i. 26, and Heb. ix. 26, not one of which is to the point. Dr. Samuel Lee of Cambridge also refers to some of these texts in order to sustain his extravagant interpretation of the phrase "before the foundation of the world" in 1 Pet. i. 20, and some other similar places, which he regards as equivalent to "before the Jewish polity had a being," before the establishment of the Hebrew church or the exode from Egypt. Thus he says the call and choice of Abraham, meaning the historical event in the patriarch's life, did "in the style of Scripture precede the foundation of the world."*—The literal meaning of the above phrase is 'from eternal times,' that is, from all past ages, which our English translation expresses, and which appears also in some of the references above given.

26. "By the scriptures of the prophets:" Partly by means of them, and partly in accordance with their attestations. Comp. iii. 21.—"Obedience of faith:" The same phrase as in i. 5.

27. The English translation, following Tyndale, Cranmer, the Geneva and Beza, omits the ᾧ. The omission certainly frees the doxology from an embarrassment which otherwise attaches to it. But the external evidence

* See his First Dissertation annexed to his Six Sermons on the study of the Holy Scriptures, Sect. viii. pp. 56-60, Lond. 1830.

Written to the Romans from Corinthus,
and sent by Phebe, servant of the church
at Cenchrea.

Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Κορίνθου
διὰ Φοίβης, τῆς διακόνου τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς
ἐκκλησίας.

is altogether in favour of the reading. The verse resumes what had been begun in the 25th. If the relative be retained, however, the sentence appears to be incomplete, as the translation will be, "to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever: Amen." The Apostle seems to commence a doxology to God, as in Eph. iii. 20, through Christ, and then to ascribe it to Christ himself. Some authorities substitute *αὐτῷ* in the place of *ᾧ*, or regard this as an anacoluthon* and translate *to him*. Olshausen accedes to the view of Glöckler, a late German critic, who understands the verb *συνίστημι*. The verse will then read thus: 'To the only wise God *I commend you* through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever;' and the doxology will relate to Christ. The reference in it to making known the Gospel to the Gentiles, and the statement that this accords with the declarations in the prophetic Scriptures, are strikingly in harmony with one prominent thought which pervades the whole Epistle.

* This is a Rhetorical term meaning, want of sequence. It is applied to clauses where, through the mode of construction or the choice of words, some grammatical inaccuracy has occurred. It is derived from the negative *a* and *ἀκολουθέω*, to follow.

THE END.

A P P E N D I X.

N O T E.

THE following questions have been prepared with the view of assisting the reader of the Commentary in acquiring an accurate knowledge of its contents, and thereby of the meaning and fulness of a most important portion of the inspired volume. A careful examiner of the questions will be able to determine, whether the answers to be found in the work do, if satisfactory, contain important Christian and theological information. The author cannot but think that they may be made useful, not only to exegetical classes in theological seminaries, but also to Christians generally, who read the Bible, not simply to get through with it every year, but also to "mark, learn, and inwardly digest" its truths. The more intelligent Bible classes also may find in the answers to these questions elucidations of scriptural doctrines and facts, which are of the highest importance and deepest practical influence. I acknowledge, what has been remarked in a Review, that I have "written for the benefit of those who really wish to understand the sacred volume, and are willing to this end to take the trouble of thinking" and studying. And I will cherish the hope that among educated Christians there will always be found some, who are willing to take such trouble in order to gain a competent acquaintance with the word of God. That a very few portions of the Commentary require a knowledge of the Greek text, need not deter the merely English reader from a general study of it. In almost all cases, he will be able to ascertain the meaning.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
December 20, 1853.

APPENDIX.

QUESTIONS ON THE PRECEDING EXPOSITION.

The reader is requested to observe that the page is noted immediately after the questions founded on it.

INTRODUCTION.

WHAT was St. Paul's native place? family condition? early training? standing in Jewish learning and character? Is it probable that before his conversion he knew anything of our Lord's claims, teachings, acts, and religious system? ix.—Did his religious and intellectual training prepare him in any degree for the course to which he was afterwards called? Is there any reason to think that he felt the spiritual inadequacy of the Jewish system, before his miraculous call? x. xi.—Give some account of the origin of the Church of Rome.—Does the address of the leading Jews to him on his arrival at Rome prove that the Christian community in that city was then unknown to them, or in itself unimportant? xi.—Is there sufficient reason to think that in the church of Rome two antagonistic parties then existed, Jewish and Gentile; and that the main object of the Epistle was to reconcile their doctrinal differences?—State who probably introduced Christianity into Rome.—Mention the circumstances which made the church of Rome and its condition known to St. Paul. xii.—Of what classes of converts did the Roman church originally consist? xiii.—Who was the bearer of the Epistle, and what ecclesiastical character did she sustain?—How may the Epistle be divided?—What are the leading topics of the doctrinal parts?—Is there sufficient evidence to prove its genuineness? xiv. xv.

SECTION I.—CHAP. I. 1–15.

How far does the first section extend?—State in general its contents. p. 1.

What does St. Paul mean when he speaks of himself as “separated to the Gospel”? p. 19.—Does the true exposition of ver. 4 determine the origin of Christ's sonship, or state its publication?—What is the best connection of the words “with power”? 20.—State the leading expositions of

the phrases "spirit of holiness—grace and Apostleship—obedience to the faith—for his name—called": 20—22.—Is a "Spiritual gift" necessarily miraculous?—What is the meaning of "to have fruit?"—Why does St. Paul particularly specify Rome as a place where he would be willing to preach the Gospel? 23.

SECTION II.—CHAP. I. 16–32.

State the general subject of this section.—What reason is given for glorying in the Gospel?—What does it contain?—What is said of the works of creation? p. 1.—How did the Heathen regard them?—Why does the Apostle describe Heathen wickedness? 2.

What is the meaning of not being "ashamed of the Gospel"?—What reasons are given therefor?—Explain the general meaning of the phrases "righteousness of God" and "from faith to faith": 24–26.—What is meant by "truth" in ver. 18? and of "holding it in unrighteousness"? 26.—State the meaning of ver. 20; of "when they knew" in ver. 21.—Explain the words "they became fools." 27, 28.—What is the "truth of God" equivalent to?—State the condition of the Heathen world as described by the Apostle.—Are the charges here brought intended of every individual? 28–30.

SECTION III.—CHAP. II.

State the leading topic of this section.—Why does the Apostle here censure the Jews?—How does he represent God's judgment?—On what ground will the future award be made to each one?—What is necessary in order to become acceptable with God?—What is said of Heathen who endeavour to live agreeably to the divine law?—and of Jews who disregard it?—How does the author represent the respective conditions of Jews and Gentiles?—What description does he give of a true Jew? 2, 3.—What are the meaning and connection of "therefore" in ver. 1? 30, 31.—Wherein lies the Apostle's antithesis?—State and illustrate the meaning of "judge—according to truth—riches of goodness—not knowing," in vs. 1, 3, 4: 31, 32.—What is the logical connection of "for" in ver. 12? 32.—How are the words "sinned" and "without law" used?—In the 12th and following verses is the Apostle speaking of the scriptural ground of justification? or does he meet any error of the Jews? What is it that he here asserts? Does he introduce a supposed case?—Show from the context that he does not: 33, 34.—What is the meaning here of the word translated, "shall be justified"? 34, 35.—What does the phrase "by nature" in ver. 14 express?—What does St. Paul mean when he speaks of Gentiles doing the things of the law? 34.—Show that his representation is consistent with that made of the Heathen in the first chapter: 35.—Can the word Gentiles here be understood of those who had been converted to the Gospel?—Ex-

plain the phrase "work of the law": 36.—What is the meaning of the words rendered "the mean while—one another"?—Show the connection of ver. 16: 37.—Explain the phrase "my Gospel": 38.—State the two readings of the first part of ver. 17, and the general thought that follows: 38, 39.—Does the Greek which is rendered "approve the things that are more excellent," admit of another translation? 39.—What does "committing sacrilege" here mean?—Is any particular text of the Old Testament referred to in ver. 24?—What general thought is contained in vs. 25–29?—What does circumcision here mean?—Does the Apostle speak of a hypothetical or sincere though imperfect obedience? 40, 41.—Explain the phrase "by the letter and circumcision": 41.—Give the meaning of vs. 25–27.—What is meant by "spirit and letter"?—State the leading thought in the two last verses: 42.

SECTION IV.—CHAP. III.

What does the Apostle do in this section?—What does he state to be the chief advantage of the Jew?—How does he show that the faithlessness of a part of the nation cannot affect God's fidelity?—In reverting to the subject of justification, what is the bearing of his question, and how does he reply? 3.—How does he prove the Jews to be grievous sinners?—From what he has just said and what he had before shown, what is proved of all mankind?—What follows?—How is justification now made known?—What is declared and secured by Christ's sacrifice?—What general conclusion is then drawn?—And how is God made to appear? 4.

Show the connection between this and the preceding chapter.—Is the language in ver. 1 that of an objector?—Which translation accords best with New Testament usage, "unto them were committed," or, 'they were entrusted with'?—What is the meaning of "the oracles of God"? 43.—In what sense is the word "faith" used in ver. 3?—State the two meanings of the word translated "art judged," and its meaning here: 44.—What is the meaning of Jewish "unrighteousness commending the righteousness of God"?—Explain the phrases "taketh vengeance—speak as a man."—Where and how does the Apostle fully meet the Jewish objection? 45, 46.—What is the simplest mode of analysing the Greek text?—Is the verb in ver. 9 best explained in a passive or middle or active sense?—What sort of advantage is it that the Apostle here denies? 47.—Is "proved" the best translation of the Greek verb in ver. 9?—What is the meaning of being "under sin"?—Are the texts that follow all quoted from one portion of the Old Testament or several?—For what purpose are they quoted?—Are the specific charges here made applicable to every Jew?—If not, how are the quotations relevant to the intended purpose?—Explain the figure "open sepulchre": 48, 49.—What is the meaning of "law" in ver. 19?—Is the

conclusion which is drawn in the latter half of this verse confined to the Jews or is it general?—How is the term “law” employed in vs. 20, 21? in the sense of moral or ceremonial?—How is the knowledge of sin by law?—What is the bearing of “now” in ver. 21?—Explain the phrases “righteousness of God—the law and the prophets—witnessed”: 50, 51.—How is God’s method of justification more particularly stated in ver. 22? What does “faith” here mean?—What difference is there between “unto” and “upon”? 52.—What is meant by “the glory of God—redemption—freely”? 53, 54.—“Set forth”: show why this translation is preferable to ‘ordained.’—“Propitiation”: Does this allude to the idea of “mercy seat,” or “sacrifice”?—What is meant by “faith in Christ’s blood”?—State the various forms in which the object of faith is expressed in the New Testament: 54, 55.—What is the most probable meaning of “righteousness” in ver. 26? 56.—How is *the believer* expressed in the Greek? Give one or two similar expressions.—What is the force of the words “at this time”?—In ver. 27, what is “law” equivalent to? 57.—What are “circumcision and uncircumcision” put for in ver. 30?—How does the New Testament doctrine of justification sustain moral law? 58.

SECTION V.—CHAP. IV.

How is justification by faith here proved and applied?—What law has the Apostle’s preceding course of argument in view? Does he continue to limit the discussion to moral law? 4.—What confidence gives occasion to his remarks?—On what ground does the Scripture put the justification of Abraham?—How does David describe the condition of the justified man?—Does this condition belong exclusively to Jews?—Was Abraham justified before or after his circumcision?—Of what then was it an attestation?—Of whom did he therefore become the spiritual parent?—In consequence of what was the great promise given to him?—To whom is this promise secured? 5.—How does the Apostle describe Abraham’s faith?—Why was this recorded in the Old Testament? 6.

Mention the different meanings which the first verse will bear according as it is variously pointed. State the connection and meaning of “as pertaining to the flesh:” 59, 60.—What reply is given to the question in this verse? 60.—In the phrase, “counted unto him for righteousness,” what is the meaning of “for? righteousness? counted unto?” What other equivalent terms to the last are employed in our translation and in theological discussion? What is said to be thus counted or reckoned or imputed to?—What language does the Apostle here use in speaking of justification?—Give the sense of the various expressions.—Is there any difference in the general idea conveyed by each? Is the term righteousness or justification best adapted to express the Apostle’s meaning? 61,

62.—What general principle is laid down in verse 4?—Explain the phrase “worketh not.”—Does the language of the Homily on Salvation agree with this?—What is the full signification of “him that justifieth the ungodly”?—What state of blessedness does the quotation from the Psalm denote? What are the necessary conclusions deducible from the passage as here applied?—Illustrate the second by other language of St. Paul.—State his idea of justification.—Prove that the Homily contains the same view: 62–64.—“What does the author show in vs. 9–12?—Has the phrase, “for we say,” a logical connection with anything previous?—Was Abraham’s faith available to his justification before his circumcision or after?—If before, in what light is his circumcision to be regarded? 64.—Explain the terms “sign and seal—sign of circumcision.”—What is the antecedent of “which” in ver. 11?—Which is the more probable translation, “that” or so that “he might be”? Of whom was Abraham to become the spiritual parent? What is the force here of the Greek preposition expressed by the English word “though”? After the words “father of circumcision” in ver. 12, what is the meaning of the remainder of the verse, and whom does it describe? 65.—Show the logical connection of “for” in ver. 13.—What is the meaning of the word “seed”?—Explain the parallel place in Gal. iii. 16.—In harmony with this explanation develop the full signification of the phrase “heir of the world.”—Is the last clause of the verse applicable to Christ? 66, 67.—Who are meant by “they of the law” in ver. 14?—What general principle is now laid down? In what other parts of this Epistle is it again stated? Explain “all” or the whole “seed” in ver. 16: 68.—How and why do the words “of the law” in ver. 16 differ from the same words in ver. 14?—Where is the quotation in ver. 17 taken from?—Show its relevancy to the Apostle’s purpose.—What is the connection of “before him”?—Illustrate the description now given of God: 69.—What sort of a quotation is that at the end of ver. 18?—Explain the 19th verse both with and without the negative reading.—Why is the efficacy of Abraham’s faith recorded in Scripture?—What is implied in the belief which is spoken of in ver. 24? 70, 71.

SECTION VI.—CHAP. V. 1–11.

What consequences are traced in this section?—What is justification followed by?—State the condition of the justified man.—How is the love of God set in contrast with human affection?—What follows from the fact that God gave his son to die for sinners? 6, 7.

What is the most accurate translation of the first Greek word? 71.—“Rejoice:” does the original term occur elsewhere in this connection differently translated?—In what does the Apostle represent the Christian

as rejoicing?—What is probably the true meaning here of the word rendered “experience.”—Explain the phrases “hope maketh not ashamed,” and “the love of God.”—Does the effusion of the Spirit here spoken of refer to his ordinary or extraordinary influences? 72.—Illustrate the phrase “in due time” by a parallel one in Galatians.—What do verses 7 and 8 express?—State the meaning of the words “righteous” and “good,” and show the connection of the two clauses in ver. 7: 73, 74.—What is the meaning of “justified by his blood,” in ver. 9, and what doctrines are therein implied?—What life of Christ is referred to in ver. 10?—Quote one or two parallel texts.—Explain the words, “received the atonement”: 74, 75.

SECTION VII.—CHAP. V. 12–21.

What is the general train of thought in this section?—What does the Apostle now proceed to show?—How was sin introduced into the world?—What followed?—How extensive were the results?—How does it appear that death was the consequence of Adam’s transgression?—State the Apostle’s representation of the correspondence between Adam and Christ, and the points of dissimilarity: 7.—For what purpose was moral law introduced? 8.

State the design of St. Paul as in harmony with the scope of the Epistle: 75, 76. What is the connection and meaning of “therefore?”—Who is meant by the “one man,” and why is he specified? 76.—What does the word sin generally express?—What else does it here denote?—State the meaning of the Apostle’s first proposition.—In what sense does he here employ the word “death”?—State the meaning of the second proposition.—What repetition is contained in the latter half of the verse?—State and defend the true meaning of the words “for that”: 77–79.—Mention the three leading expositions of the phrase “have sinned”: 79–81.—What objections may be urged against the first?—Can it be allowed that the author makes his statement without regard to infants and idiots? 79, 80.—According to the second exposition what will the statement be?—Does this sense correspond with that of any other in this context?—Is it sanctioned by similar scriptural language? 80, 81.—According to the third leading exposition what does the statement comprehend?—May then the degree and extent of the death alluded to vary?—Has this last view been objected to?—How does the context bear on this sense? 81.—How does scriptural analogy?—Does this view militate against the comparison drawn by the Apostle between Christ and Adam?—In what does this comparison consist? 82.—What is the Apostle’s general statement? 83.—Is the construction of the verse clear?—Give the views on this point of some of the most distinguished commentators:—Is

“during” or ‘until’ the better translation?—Are the Apostle’s declarations in vs. 13, 14, merely independent propositions? 84.—If not, how are they logically connected, and how stands the argument? 85.—Can a sufficient reason be given for the limitation of the period “to Moses”? 86. Is the application of the words, “even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression,” necessarily confined to infants and idiots?—Who is meant by “him that is to come”? Is the Greek term the one commonly used for the Messiah? 87.—Explain the meaning of “figure” or ‘type’: 87, 88.—What points of dissimilarity does the author now proceed to note?—What is the proper meaning of “the many”? 88.—In the first clause of ver. 16, is the true Greek reading a participle or a noun?—How did the latter reading probably arise?—How may the ellipsis in the first clause of this verse be supplied?—State the difference in meaning between the Greek phrases rendered “by one” in our translation;—the bearing of the word “receive” in ver. 17: 89;—the idea conveyed by “abundance of grace.”—Does the Apostle teach that the benefit derived through Christ exceeds the evil entailed through Adam? 90, 91.—In ver. 18, which is the better translation, “the offence of one—the righteousness of one,” or ‘one offence—one righteousness’? 91.—What is to be supplied in the two clauses of this verse?—State the meaning of “were made” in ver. 19: 92.—Is the promise in the latter clause absolute, or does it imply some condition?—In ver. 20, is “the law” limited to the Mosaic?—What is the full force of the word translated “entered”? 93.—Where and how does the author explain more fully the meaning of, “that the offence might abound”?—What are the contrasted expressions in ver. 21? 94.

SECTION VIII.—CHAP. VI.

What is the practical tendency of the doctrines before explained?—What is the baptized Christian’s condition, and what connection has it with a life of holiness?—How is our future glorious resurrection a result of our present moral one?—What influence should Christ’s death and life in heaven have on us?—Why are we enabled to live a holy life?—How is the Christian’s condition contrasted with his former natural one?—State the two leading thoughts in the chapter: 8.

What practical error does the Apostle now guard against?—State his two important considerations:—What sort of language is “dead to sin”? 95.—In explaining figurative language what caution is necessary? Illustrate the figure here employed.—State the difference between John’s baptism and Christ’s: 96.—What is real Christian baptism?—Recite St. Peter’s definition of baptism.—How is the figure of clothing used in the Bible?—What is meant by putting on the Lord Jesus?—Give some illus-

trations of the phrase.—How does this view accord with that in our catechism? 97.—How does the Apostle speak of baptism and of the baptized?—Does he carry out the figure with which he begins?—In ver. 4 does he allude to the mode of baptizing by immersion? 98.—What does ‘planted or grown together’ imply?—Has the author a twofold resurrection in view?—Explain the phrases “old man—new man—body of sin—freed from sin.” 99.—Can the living with Christ which is spoken of in ver. 8 be limited to the present state?—Explain what is meant by Christ’s having “died unto sin,” and “living unto God;” also, “once”: 100.—On what is the exhortation begun in ver. 11 founded?—Why is the Christian’s being under grace and not law a reason for sin’s not ruling him? 101.—Can you assign any reason why some transcribers have rejected the words “unto death” in ver. 16?—What is the meaning of “righteousness”? 102.—Explain the last phrase of ver. 17: 103.—In ver. 18 et seq., how are sin and righteousness represented?—What idea is conveyed by the phrase “iniquity unto iniquity”?—What verbal antithesis is stated in vs. 21, 22? 104;—And contrast in ver. 23? 105.

SECTION IX.—CHAP. VII.—VIII. 17.

What does St. Paul intend to show in this section?—What use does he make of the analogy drawn from the marriage relation?—Is it the Jews or the law that he represents as dead?—How is the influence of law on sinful nature depicted?—What two conditions are described by the words “I was alive once without the law,” and “when the commandment came I died”?—What character does the Apostle proceed to personate?—How does he describe its perceptions and feelings?—How does he represent man’s reason and conscience in opposition to his sinful nature?—What is the natural result of the struggle?—How is deliverance to be obtained?—In his Christian condition, can the man obey God’s law?—Is he as before, in a state of condemnation?—What does the Gospel effect which the law could not do?—What are the respective results of submission to the carnal and the spiritual principle?—What is said to be the ultimate blessed effect of the indwelling of the Spirit?—What is the test of true filiation? 9, 10.

The connection of what two doctrines is here implied?—What is the meaning of “know the law”? 105; and to whom does the Apostle address himself?—Does the word “liveth” relate to the man or the law?—Explain the phrase “law of her husband.”—For what purpose is the thought in vs. 2, 3, introduced?—What is the general idea of the illustration? 106.—How does the Apostle apply his comparison?—What is meant by “the body of Christ”?—Apart from the figure what is the thought?—What two contrary states are expressed in vs. 5, 6?—Explain

the phrases "in the flesh, 107,—passions of sins—by the law—members."—What is the phrase "to bring forth fruit unto death" contrasted with? 108.—What is the true reading of the Greek which is translated "that being dead"?—Explain and defend the meaning of that reading.—What do the phrases "newness of spirit and oldness of letter" denote?—Why does the Apostle put the question, "is the law sin"? 108, 109.—In what follows does St. Paul speak of himself?—Does he intend to represent a regenerate or ante-regenerate condition?—Can this point be determined by the sense which some phrases will bear?—What is the best clew to his meaning?—What state of mind does he describe? 109, 110.—In the whole representation extending into the next chapter, what stages of development are distinguishable?—In ver. 8 what is the meaning of "sin"? What is the best connection of the phrase "by the commandment"?—What is the meaning of the words "I was alive"? 111, 112.—In what sense is the word "commandment" employed?—How is it here said to come?—What is meant by "I died"? 112, 113.—To what does the word "deceived" appear to allude?—What is here said to slay?—Is the same elsewhere asserted of the law?—Explain the meaning in each case: 113.—State the different modifications of meaning, and that which is the most probable, of the 13th verse after "God forbid."—What does the particle "for" in the beginning of verse 14 imply? 114.—What does the word "spiritual" denote?—Explain "carnal, sold under sin."—What is described in vs. 15–20? 115.—Explain the phrases, "I allow not—consent unto—now—no more—I—my flesh:" 116.—What is here the meaning of "to will"?—Give the general sense of these verses.—What is "the law" spoken of in verse 21?—What is it elsewhere called? 117.—With what is it contrasted?—Show the scriptural meaning of the phrase "inward (or inner) man": 118.—State and refute certain objections which have been urged against this meaning: 119.—What is the force of the word rendered, "I delight in"? and what idea does it express? 119, 120.—What result is denoted by the phrase, "bringing me into captivity"?—Explain what is meant by "the body of this death": 120.—What does the first clause of ver. 25 express?—What reading of the Greek is the best?

Recapitulate certain particulars contained in this chapter, either by direct expression or necessary implication: 121–123.—Who is intended by the words "I myself"?—Explain the terms "mind—flesh—serve."—State the more prominent expositions of the last sentence: 124, 125;—the force of the particle "now" in viii. 1;—the meaning of "in Christ Jesus."—Is the remainder of the verse genuine?—Explain the phrases "the law of the spirit of life—the law of sin and death."—With what does the latter stand in contradistinction?—Illustrate the Greek which is translated, "what the law could not do": 125, 126.—What does "the flesh" here mean?—How does the phrase "sending his own son" bear upon the

doctrine of the sonship of Christ?—Explain “likeness of sinful flesh”;—the Greek rendered “for sin;—condemned;—in the flesh.”—What other thing does the author now point out which Christ did? 127.—What sort of fulfilment of righteousness is intended?—Confirm the true meaning by some other phrases.—State the force of “in.”—What character does the latter part of the text describe?—State and illustrate the meaning of “mind.”—What is the meaning of the noun translated “to be minded” and “the mind,” taken actively and passively? 128.—Which is to be preferred?—How is the same word employed in our 19th article?—What are the respective results of the influence of the two principles?—How is the enmity of the carnal mind to God shown?—What is the meaning of “in the Spirit”? His indwelling?—“Christ in you”? 129.—Is there any difference between the meaning of Spirit in ver. 9 and in ver. 11?—Explain the phrase, “the body is dead because of sin” in ver. 10;—the meaning of “righteousness”; 130.—In verse 11, what is the true reading and translation of the Greek rendered “by his Spirit”?—Give the sense of the whole verse; 130, 131.—Explain the phrase, “deeds of the body” in ver. 13; 132;—also “spirit of bondage—Spirit of adoption” in ver. 15: 132.—What is the thought in the latter part of this verse?—Explain the difference between the form of expression here and in Gal. iv. 6.—What is the scriptural test of filiation?—What is the proper force of the Greek preposition here employed? 133, 134.

SECTION X.—CHAP. VIII. 18-39.

In this section what are compared?—Are mankind in general represented as waiting for a happier condition?—Is this true also of Christians?—What are the trials of life intended to promote?—How is the operation of God’s eternal affection towards the subjects of it represented?—What appeals does the Apostle now make?—What persuasion does he avow? 11, 12.

Show the connection of this portion with what immediately precedes: 134.—Give the correct translation of the word rendered “manifestation” in ver. 2.—Explain the sense of “glory.”—What is the meaning of “the revelation of the sons of God”? 135, 136.—State the three leading expositions of the word here rendered “creature” and in verse 22 “creation”: 136-138.—Defend the last of these expositions: 138-140.—Explain what is meant by “vanity—bondage of corruption”: 140, 142.—Show the meaning of and contrast between “not willingly” and “by reason of him who hath subjected”: 140, 141.—Illustrate the best meaning and connection of the first word in ver. 21.—Give the thought in ver. 22: 142.—What is meant by “first fruits of the Spirit?—adoption and redemption”? 143.—Which is the better translation, *by* or *in* hope?—

What is meant by “saved”?—What is the force of “likewise”?—the full sense of the word rendered “helpeth”?—What is meant by the Spirit’s interceding? 144.—“unutterable groanings”?—Explain the language of ver. 27.

State the propositions contained in verse 28 et seq. 145.—How often does the noun and verb “purpose” occur in the New Testament, as bearing on the subject here brought into consideration?—Give the places.—What is its meaning in ix. 11?—What does it comprehend in Eph. i. 11?—Explain the words “things in heaven and on earth”; 146.—What is said to be in accordance with the purposes of God?—When is this predestination and choice represented as being made?—Are they limited to outward and temporary blessings?—Does God’s purpose mentioned in Eph. iii. 11, relate to the union of Jews and Gentiles in the church of Christ? 147.—Is this union all that it had in view?—Has it not a bearing on angelic beings?—Explain the meaning and bearing of 2 Tim. i. 9. 148.—State now what God’s purpose embraces:—Is it a necessary consequence that the intended result shall take place?—May God’s will as represented in Scripture fail of accomplishment?—Does the Apostle speak of God’s will in close connection with his purpose?—Does this connection illustrate the nature of each? 149.—Who then are the “called according to his purpose”?—“Foreknow”: can the meaning be limited to a simple previous knowledge?—Does it mean a foreknowledge of a disposition to embrace the gospel? Does it express the same idea as “predestinate”? 149, 150.—State and defend another more probable meaning of the word:—What is the nature of that conformity to Christ’s image which predestination has in view?—To what is the expression “first born” equivalent?—What is expressed by the terms “called? 151, justified? glorified”?—Explain and illustrate the last.—In all this portion of whom is the Apostle speaking? 152.—Can the calling &c. here spoken of be limited to the enjoyment of the present blessings of the Gospel?—What is St. Peter’s language on this point?—Is any difficulty removed by supposing St. Paul to be speaking of communities?—Does the Apostle here teach any thing of those who are not Christians? 153, 154.—What does the word “all” in verse 32 recognise?—What is the best punctuation of the following verses? 154.—What does the word “elect” express?—Illustrate its meaning from the Old Testament and the Apostolic fathers: 155.—Does the phrase “love of Christ” mean ‘our love to him’ or ‘his to us’?—Do the following verses sustain the doctrine of final perseverance?—How does the language in Phil. i. 6, illustrate their meaning?—How are the expressions that follow to be understood? 157.

SECTION XI.—CHAP. IX. X. XI.

Mention the general topics of this section.—Why does the Apostle express his grief so deeply?—What privileges of his nation does he display?—What constitutes the true spiritual Israelite?—How is the author's sentiment illustrated in the patriarchal history? 12, 13.—How does God act in favouring and punishing?—What cases are mentioned in illustration?—What Jewish objection is stated?—Give the Apostle's reply, both generally and particularly: 13, 14.—What application does he make of certain passages from the prophets?—What general conclusion does he then sum up?—To what is the failure of Israel owing?—Wherein was their zeal for the law shown to be erroneous?—How is Christ the end or object of the law?—How may legal justification be expressed?—What does God's justification offer?—Is this offer general?—What must be done in order to enjoy its blessings? 14.—Was it to be expected that some would reject the Gospel?—Could the Israelites know that it was the divine purpose to extend it to the Gentiles?—Does the rejection of unbelieving Jews imply the final rejection of the nation?—How does the case of Israel in the time of Elijah coincide with their condition as stated by the Apostle?—To whom are the seven thousand analogous?—What is the condition of the remainder?—What has been the result of the rejection of the Gospel by the Jews as regards the Gentiles? 15.—And what might be expected from their conversion?—From the character and condition of the patriarchs and early converts, how does the Apostle represent the whole body?—How does he warn the Gentile?—Does he seem to expect a future conversion of the Jews as a nation?—How do God's plans evince his intention of showing mercy to all? 16.

Are these chapters without connection with the preceding ones?—Why does the Apostle introduce them with such strong expressions of attachment to his nation? 158, 159.—Explain the phrases "in Christ,—I could wish,—accursed":—What is meant by becoming anathema from Christ?—State the Apostle's general meaning.—Why is the word "Israelite" here selected? 159, 160.—Explain the terms here used to express Jewish privileges.—Is the received reading of the last phrase in ver. 5 correct? 161.—Can the punctuation be altered, and the words be regarded as an ascription of praise to God?—What is the invariable scriptural construction in such ascriptions? 162, 163.—What is meant by "the word of God" in ver. 6?—State the different significations of the word "Israel" in the same verse: 163.—What is the idea which the Apostle expresses?—Explain the phrase "children of the flesh—of the Spirit—according to the time of life."—Does the 8th verse contain a merely accommodated sense, or does it convey the true meaning of the phrases? 164.—Why does the Apostle introduce the case of Rebecca after that of Sarah?—What is

nere meant by "God's purpose according to election"?—From what did this purpose result? 165.—Are the individuals Jacob and Esau here intended, or their descendants?—Explain the antithetic expressions "love" and "hate": 166, 167.—What would the Apostle's Jewish readers infer from what he had said?—Explain the origin and meaning of the word Moses: 167, 168.—What is the thought of which the particle "for" in ver. 15 is illative?—In what connection does the quotation from Exodus occur?—Explain the terms "willeth" and "runneth."—What does the case of Pharaoh stand in contradistinction to? 168.—What principle do both illustrate?—Translate the Hebrew and Septuagint words for that here used by the Apostle.—State the principal translations which have been given to his expression.—Why does he substitute the first person for the second as employed in the Septuagint? 169, 170.—Illustrate the meaning from the connection in which the quotation stands in Exodus.—Explain the phrase "he hardeneth": 170, 171.—On what is the objection in the 19th verse founded?—Give in detail the Apostle's general answer: 171.—What is his direct answer to the Jew?—"Power over the clay": Illustrate the Greek phrase.—In ver. 22, is there a suppression of the sense, or an ellipsis?—Explain "vessels of wrath—of mercy": 172.—State the difference between the expressions "fitted for" and "which he had afore prepared unto."—Mention the probable connection and bearing of the words, "that he might make known": 173, 174.—"Afore prepared": Illustrate and defend this meaning of the Greek word: 175, 176.—Give the leading train of thought from ver. 14: 176, 177.—Who are meant "by the vessels of mercy" as here stated by the Apostle?—Of whom is Hosea speaking in the passage here quoted? 177.—What is the meaning of "in the place"?—How is the quotation applied?—Explain the full sense of the remnant being saved: 178.—How is the quotation from Isa. i. 9 to be explained? 179.—In ver. 28, what is the best translation of the word rendered "work"?—Explain the whole verse connected with it.—What does Isaiah express by it? 180, 181.—How does St. Paul apply it?—Which is the best construction, that which regards vs. 30, 31, as the question, and what immediately follows "wherefore" as the answer; or the usual one, which limits the question to the first clause? 181.—What bearing have these verses on the interpretation of the preceding part of the chapter?—What is meant by the Gentiles not following after justification?—Explain the words "law of righteousness" or justification.—Explain the particle rendered "as it were": 182, 183.—Where is the quotation in ver. 33 taken from?—State its general meaning: 183.—Explain the phrases "stumbling-stone and rock of offence"; also the difference between the translation "shall not be ashamed" here given, and "shall not make haste" in the Old Testament.

How may we account for the introduction of "Israel" in x. 1? 184.—

“Bear record”: State the different meanings of the word, and that here required.—Explain and illustrate the phrase “zeal of God.”—What is the illative force of “for” in ver. 4?—What is meant by Christ’s being “the end of the law for justification”? 185, 186.—In ver. 5 does St. Paul imply that justification can be of law? or that Moses meant to describe it? 186.—How are the quotations here made intended to be applied?—Explain the sense of “that is” in vs. 6, 7: also of “going up to heaven, down to the abyss, and over the sea,” 187;—and other similar phraseology.—What is the thought which St. Paul expresses?—Explain the phrases “in thy mouth and in thy heart”; also, “the word of faith”: 188.—What is meant by “Jew and Greek”?—What does the word “rich” imply?—What is “call upon” equivalent to?—Who is the object of prayer here intended?—Explain the meaning and connection of the quotation from Joel: 189.—What is implied in being “sent” to preach the Gospel? 190, 191.—Are the quotations in vs. 15, 16, accommodated?—How is that in ver. 18 applied?—Explain the difference between the word “sound” here used and “line” in the Psalm: 191.—State the course of remark from ver. 13:—What is the purport of the question, “did not Israel know”?—How do the quotations afford the affirmative answer?—What is meant by exciting the Israelites to jealousy by no people? 192, 193.

What does the Apostle proceed to do in the 11th chapter? 193.—Is the phrase “his people” to be limited to those Israelites who had embraced the Gospel, or does it comprehend the nation as a body? 194.—Why does St. Paul speak here so particularly of himself? 194, 195.—What bearing on his representation has the case of Elijah here stated?—Sustain the view given by subsequent verses: 195.—How does the conclusion arrived at harmonize with some prophecies, and with the preservation of the Jews as a people?—Explain the obsolete word “wot.”—Is “of” or “in Elias” the more literal version? 196, 197.—Is Baal feminine or masculine?—What does the language, a “remnant according to the election of grace,” mean? and to what does it refer? 197.—What sentiment is expressed in ver. 6?—How does the statement here made differ from that in ix. 31 and x. 3?—Explain the word “election” as here used.—What is the general meaning of vs. 9, 10?—For what purpose are the texts here quoted?—Show the connection of the clause “unto this day”: 198, 199.—Explain the phrase “spirit of slumber.”—Give the general meaning of vs. 11, 12. 199.—Explain the words “stumbling, falling”; also, the phrases “provoke to jealousy, riches of the world:” 200.—Instead of “diminishing,” what is the marginal reading?—What is the meaning of the Greek word? 200, 201.—What is denoted by “fulness”?—Explain the words, “I magnify mine office,” in harmony with the context.—What is the force of the expression, “my flesh”? 201, 202.—What is meant by “life from the dead”?—To what does the language in the first clause of ver. 16 allude?—Does the

term "first fruits" refer to the patriarchs or early converts?—What are meant by "the root and branches"? 202, 203.—In ver. 17 who are intended in the words "among and with them"?—Explain the illustration from inserting grafts of a wild olive into a good one: 204.—What word would most naturally supply the ellipsis in ver. 21?—How is the divine readiness to receive repentant Jews expressed in ver. 24? 205.—What is the general meaning of the word "mystery" in the New Testament?—With what is "in part" best connected?—What does the clause "until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in" express?—What is meant by "all Israel"? 205, 206.—What is to be said respecting the quotations in vs. 26, 27? 207, 208.—State the meaning of vs. 28, 29, as given on p. 195.—To what does ver. 30 refer?—What is the best punctuation of ver. 31, and the meaning of its latter half? 209.—What is meant by "concluded in unbelief"?—Recite a similar passage in Galatians.—How is God said to do this? 209, 210.—State the meaning of ver. 33 in the English translation, and also in that which substitutes *and* for *both*.—Give the sentiment in vs. 34, 35; also the idea in ver. 36: 211.

SECTION XII.—CHAPS. XII.—XVI.

How may this part of the Epistle be characterized in contradistinction to the former?—What does St. Paul urge upon his readers in the 12th chapter?—What in the 13th, and what motive does he employ?—State the general contents of the 14th.—How does he there present the example of Christ?—What does he say of himself?—What does the last chapter chiefly contain? 17.

Give the sense of "prove" in xii. 2? 212.—What is the general signification of prophet and prophecy in the Bible? 213.—Explain the phrase "analogy of faith": 213, 214.—What is meant by "providing things honest"? 215.—Explain "give place unto": 215, 216.—State the prominent idea in vs. 20, 21: 216.—What sort of authority is intended in xiii. 1 et seq.? 217.—Explain the motive to the practice of Christian virtues which is employed in ver. 11: 219, 220.—What idea is expressed by the words "put on"?—How is the quotation from Isaiah applied in xiv. 11, 12? 222.—What is the sense of "destroy" in ver. 15?—What is meant by "your good"? 223.—Explain the phrase "kingdom of God": 223, 224.—What is meant by "work of God" and "faith"? 224.—Is there sufficient reason for placing here the doxology of xvi. 25–27?—Is the quotation in xv. 3 properly accommodated?—To what class does it belong? 225.—In vs. 8, 9, for what purpose does the Apostle represent Christ as sent: 226.—Is the representation in ver. 16 to be understood literally or figuratively? 227.—Explain and illustrate it by other similar places: 227, 228.—In ver. 19, from whence is the translation "fully preached" derived?

228.—Is there reason to think that St. Paul ever accomplished his purpose of going to Spain?—Substitute some expository phrase for “sealed to them this fruit:” 228, 229.—Explain the figure in xvi. 4.—What is meant by “the church that is in their house”?—Reconcile the statement here made with 1 Cor. xvi. 15.—Explain the words “of note among the Apostles”: 230, 231.—How was the kiss of peace used among the early Christians? 231.—Explain and illustrate the figure in ver. 20: 232.—Vindicate the true meaning of the words, “since the world began”: 233.—Explain the relative pronoun in the Greek of ver. 27: 234.

THE END.